VOL 15 No 1 JANUARY 1985 BIND SHELF

SURVEY of Current Affairs

Government and Administration

By-election and State of the Parties 3
Representation of the People Bill 3
Local Government Bill 5
Emergency Provisions in Northern Ireland 7

External Affairs and Defence

Britain and East-West Relations 10
North Atlantic Treaty Organisation 12
Afghanistan 14
Future of Hong Kong 16
Britain and South Africa 17
Aid to Ethiopia 18

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Banking Developments 19
London Area Airports 20
Controlling Pollution 21
Shorter Notes
Loan Guarantee Scheme 23; Exchange Risk Guarantee Scheme 23; Aid for Shipbuilding, Steel and Textile Areas 23; Multi-fibre Arrangement 24; Radioactive Waste Disposal at Sea 24; Acid Rain 25

Social and Cultural Affairs

Shorter Notes
International Youth Year 26; European Music Year 26; Poet Laureate 27

Documentation 28

DA 10 .S9

University of Cincinnati
APR 0 3 1985
Library

Prepared for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office by the Central Office of Information and published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London

Annual subscription including postage and index £22

The *Survey of Current Affairs* is produced primarily for use overseas, but in response to requests has also been made available in Britain. Subscription and distribution inquiries should be addressed to Her Majesty's Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London SE1 9NH, and editorial inquiries to Reference Services, Publications Division, Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7DU. Although the material is Crown Copyright, it may be reproduced without special permission.
Other documents produced by Reference Services, if not on sale through Her Majesty's Stationery Office, may be obtained direct from Distribution Unit (Overseas), Publications Division, Central Office of Information, at the above address on payment of a small charge.

GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

By-election and State of the Parties

Details of the result of a recent parliamentary by-election and the present state of the parties in the House of Commons are given below.

The Conservative Party retained the seat at Enfield, Southgate in a parliamentary by-election on 13 December 1984. The seat became vacant when its holder, Sir Anthony Berry, was killed in the explosion of an IRA bomb during the Conservative Party Conference in October (see pp 363-4, 1984). The Conservative candidate, Mr Michael Portillo, won by a majority of 4,711 votes.

The results were as follows:

M. Portillo (Conservative)	16,684
T. Slack (Liberal-Social Democratic Alliance)	11,973
W. Hamid (Labour)	4,000

Six other candidates between them received a total of 988 votes. They and the Labour candidate all lost their deposits. Votes were cast by 51 per cent of the electorate.

At the general election in June 1983, when 69·6 per cent of the electorate voted, the seat was held by the Conservative Party with Sir Anthony Berry polling 26,451 votes, followed by the Alliance candidate with 10,632 votes, and the Labour candidate with 8,132 votes.

State of the Parties

Following the by-election, the state of the parties in the House of Commons is now as follows:

Conservative	394
Labour	207
Liberal	17
Social Democratic	7
Scottish National	2
Plaid Cymru (Welsh Nationalist)	2
Ulster Unionist (Northern Ireland)	11
Democratic Unionist (Northern Ireland)	3
Ulster Popular Unionist (Northern Ireland)	1
Social Democratic and Labour (Northern Ireland)	1
Sinn Fein (Northern Ireland)	1
TOTAL	646

The four remaining seats are held by the Speaker of the House of Commons and his three deputies (the Chairman of Ways and Means and the first and second Deputy Chairmen of Ways and Means) who do not vote except in their official capacity in the event of a tie. The government majority over all other parties is 142, although the Sinn Fein MP has not taken his seat.

Representation of the People Bill

The Representation of the People Bill was given a second reading in the House of Commons on 10 December 1984. Its provisions include extending the franchise to British citizens resident abroad, enabling holidaymakers and others unable to vote in person at an election to apply for a postal or proxy vote, and increasing the deposit at parliamentary elections while lowering the threshold for its forfeiture. It is estimated that these provisions, which would apply to parliamentary elections throughout the United Kingdom and to local government elections in England, Wales and Scotland, would enfranchise over half a million new electors and enable a further 600,000 to exercise their right to vote.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The Bill gives effect to proposals set out in the White Paper *Representation of the People Acts* published in January 1984 (see pp 43-4, 1984). Clauses 1 to 4 give British citizens resident abroad the right to vote at parliamentary and European Parliament elections for a period of seven years after they leave the United Kingdom. Those eligible would be entitled to vote in the constituency in which they were last resident and, if of voting age, were registered as electors, and they would be required to make a declaration of residence overseas.

Clauses 5 to 10 simplify and rationalise existing provisions on absent voting. Clause 7 extends the right to apply for an absent vote at a particular parliamentary or local election in Great Britain to all those who, whatever the grounds, could not reasonably be expected to vote in person at the polling station. This provision is intended to benefit not only holidaymakers, but other voters who find themselves disenfranchised under the

present arrangements. The Bill gives all absent voters the right to choose between postal and proxy voting. It also gives absent voters the right to vote by post or proxy at all local government elections in Great Britain, including parish and community council elections in England and Wales.

Clause 11 creates an offence with regard to making false overseas electors' declarations and absent voting applications.

In Clause 12 provision is made to increase the deposit made by candidates at parliamentary elections from £150 to £1,000 and to reduce the threshold for its forfeiture from 12·5 to 5 per cent of the total number of votes cast in the constituency. Clause 13 raises various minor expense limits to the levels which already apply to European Parliament elections. Clauses 14 to 16 introduce a general system for combining elections which are held on the same day, enabling the returning officer to use the same facilities (for example, polling stations and ballot boxes) for each.

The Bill contains a number of miscellaneous and supplemental clauses, including Clause 19 which postpones polling day for two weeks if the death of the monarch occurs after the Dissolution of Parliament for a general election. Schedule 3 of the Bill makes provision for the polls at a parliamentary election to close at 9 p.m. rather than 10 p.m.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

The Representation of the People Bill was given a second reading in the House of Commons by 280 votes to 204 – a government majority of 76 (*Hansard*, Vol 69, No 25, cols 754-838).

Government View

Opening the debate, the Home Secretary, Mr Leon Brittan, spoke of the Bill's three main themes. The first was an extension of democracy. The Bill established the principle that British citizens should have the right to vote even if they were not resident in the United Kingdom on the qualifying date. Britain, said the Home Secretary, was one of the few democracies which made no provision at all for its citizens to vote while resident abroad.

Secondly, the Bill sought to ensure that, as far as possible, every person with the right to vote was able to exercise that right in person at a polling station, or if he (or she) could not reasonably be expected to do that, by post or by proxy. Mr Brittan said that he had long thought it a scandal that the penalty for going on holiday should be to lose one's basic democratic right.

Thirdly, the Bill aimed to modernise Britain's electoral machinery. Many of the features of the electoral system had been introduced in the nineteenth century and had scarcely been changed since then. The Bill dealt with a variety of detailed defects and problems which had come to light over the years. The Bill applied to parliamentary elections throughout the United Kingdom and to local government elections in England, Wales and Scotland. It did not affect local government or Assembly elections in Northern Ireland, which were governed by separate legislation, nor in general did if affect elections to the European Parliament.

Referring to the arrangements for absent voting, which applied to England, Wales and Scotland only, Mr Brittan said that particular difficulties in Northern Ireland, including the systematic abuse of postal voting on a large scale, had made it unrealistic to make postal votes available to any new categories of elector there.

As for the provisions on deposits for parliamentary candidates, Mr Brittan said that the figure of £1,000 fully reflected the decline in the value of money since the present sum of £150 was established in 1918. He considered the figure to be fair in view of the very substantial reduction from 12·5 per cent to 5 per cent proposed in the threshold for forfeiting the deposit. The 5 per cent threshold, which in most seats represented 2,000 to 3,000 votes, meant that smaller parties would in future have a much more realistic target to aim for. He did not think it unreasonable to expect a candidate to aspire to poll one vote in 20 in order to justify the considerable benefits that accrued from candidature.

Opposition Views

Mr Gerald Kaufman, chief official Opposition spokesman on home affairs, said that the Bill contained proposals that would have a profound and dangerous effect on the electoral process. The Government had gone ruthlessly ahead with proposals which they had promised to reconsider and were now forcing through legislation of which many of the most important ingredients were to some extent opposed by significant elements in the Commons.

The Bill provided for a justified demand for absentee votes for holidaymakers but did nothing to rebut the allegation that providing such a right meant introducing postal or proxy voting on demand. A new right was being introduced for electors in Great Britain, but was not available on equal terms to electors in Northern Ireland, thus making the people of Northern Ireland second-class citizens.

The Government's decision to introduce expatriate voting breached three fundamental tenets of electoral law. First, it breached the universality of the franchise. For citizens who lived in the United Kingdom, registration for the franchise was obligatory and failure to register was an offence. For expatriates, registration would be optional. Secondly, it breached the doctrine of no representation without taxation. Thirdly, it breached the residential qualification, which formed the very basis of the franchise in Britain.

As for raising the candidate's deposit, Mr Kaufman said that a candidate without ample means would be prevented from standing by a provision that was literally a tax on democracy.

Speaking for the Liberal Party, Mr Alan Beith said that the Bill had many good and some bad features. He agreed with the Government on the issue of overseas voting. He also agreed with the proposals for absent voters as there was an anomaly and unfairness in the present position,

and he welcomed the proposals to extend postal voting to parish council elections.

Mr Beith criticised the Bill's failure to end the practice of multiple registration whereby a person with two, three or four homes could be registered in all of them and could choose on election day where to vote. As for the proposed increase in the deposit, a deposit of £1,000 could in no way distinguish between those who were serious and those who were not. It merely distinguished between those who could produce £1,000 and those who could not. He believed it was wrong to allow any group to say that it had been denied, on financial grounds, the right to put its views to the voters.

Local Government Bill

The Local Government Bill, which contains provisions to abolish the Greater London Council and the metropolitan county councils and transfer their functions principally to the borough and district authorities, was given a second reading on 4 December 1984. It is estimated that, by removing the upper tier of local government in these areas and eliminating the duplication of functions, savings of £100 million annually could be achieved.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The Bill gives effect to the proposals set out in the White Paper *Streamlining the Cities* (see pp 353-7, 1983). Part I abolishes the Greater London Council (GLC) and the six metropolitan county councils of Greater Manchester, Merseyside, South Yorkshire, Tyne and Wear, West Midlands and West Yorkshire from 1 April 1986.

Part II contains the arrangements for transferring most of the functions of these county councils to the London boroughs and metropolitan district councils. These comprise town and country planning, highways and road traffic, waste regulation and disposal, land drainage and flood prevention, the administration of justice and other miscellaneous functions.

Part III provides for the Inner London Education Authority (at present a special committee of the GLC) to become a directly elected education authority composed of members elected for electoral divisions initially consisting of each of the parliamentary constituencies in the Inner London area. The Secretary of State will be required, by 1991, to review the new authority's exercise of its functions, and as a result may transfer some or all of its education functions to all or any of the Inner London boroughs and the Common Council of the City of London.

Part IV establishes joint authorities to run the fire brigade and civil defence in London, and police, fire and passenger transport in each metropolitan county. There is provision for the functions of joint authorities to be transferred subsequently to some or all of their constituent authorities.

Part V deals with the arts and voluntary organisations. For the most part, the functions at present exercised by the GLC and the metropolitan county councils will pass to the boroughs and districts, but in a few cases special arrangements are needed – for example, responsibility for the South Bank arts complex which will be transferred to the Arts Council. Provision is made for borough and district councils in each area to act together in giving grants to voluntary organisations.

Part VI makes provision for staff transferred to or recruited by the authorities taking over functions from the GLC or the metropolitan county councils.

Part VII establishes a residuary body in each area, consisting of members appointed by the Secretary of State, to deal with certain residual matters, including the administration of existing debt and superannuation funds. These bodies, which would be purely temporary, would be required to take all reasonable steps to wind up their activities within five years of the abolition date.

Part VIII deals with finance, including detailed transitional arrangements concerning grant related expenditure, block grant and targets.

Part IX contains miscellaneous and supplementary provisions, including provision for the Secretary of State to make schemes, for the three years following the abolition date, to determine the number of people employed by the new authorities.

Financial Effects

The Government's current estimate is that, subject to decisions yet to be taken by successor authorities, a saving of some £100 million annually would be achievable by removing a tier of government and eliminating duplication of functions. Transitional costs, chiefly compensation to staff for redundancy, are estimated at about £40 million in 1986-87.

Public Service Manpower

As a result of the proposals, local authority manpower would be reduced by an estimated 8,000 with an increase in other public sector bodies of about 900 posts.

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATE

The Bill was given a second reading in the House of Commons by 354 votes to 219, a government majority of 135 (*Hansard*, Vol 69, No 20, cols 27-118 and Vol 69, No 21, cols 119-31, 173-280).

Government View

Opening the two-day debate on 3 December, the Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Patrick Jenkin, said that almost all the service functions of the GLC and the metropolitan county councils would be devolved to the London boroughs and the metropolitan districts. The system established in London in 1965 had never really settled down and the creation of powerful boroughs, the sharing of major functions between the tiers, the lack of a clearly defined role for the GLC, all made for

conflict and confusion. To the GLC, Greater London was a single administrative area to be run from the centre. To most Londoners, London was a series of separate local areas with very diverse characteristics. The GLC had never been more than the minor partner in the provision of local government services in London; the major partners were, and since 1965 had been, the London boroughs.

In the case of the metropolitan counties, no fewer than 33 of the 36 metropolitan districts encompassed former county boroughs; they had always resented the loss of powers to weak and ineffective upper-tier authorities, and people had never identified with the metropolitan counties. While the metropolitan counties had run some services well, they did not have enough major functions to justify their existence as a separate directly-elected tier of government.

Of the three options open to the Government in changing the present structure – giving the seven authorities increased powers, retaining them but with reduced powers, or abolishing them – the Government had chosen abolition; it believed that local government should be local and it saw no place for a two-tier structure in London or in the metropolitan counties.

The Bill was not intended to transfer wholesale local authority functions to central government. Based on this year's budgeted spending by the upper-tier authorities, only about 5 per cent of the GLC's service functions would pass to government departments or agencies, including flood protection, some roads, historic buildings and major arts activities. About 95 per cent of its functions would be devolved directly to the London boroughs and a new joint fire authority. In the metropolitan counties, virtually all service functions would go to the districts and to the joint authorities.

There was no deep-laid plot aimed at a central government takeover, continued Mr Jenkin; the Bill was not the end of local democracy in London and the metropolitan counties. Its central purpose was to provide a more local and a more accountable system of local government. People in these areas would have only one local council to deal with. They would look to their local councillors to deal with complaints and queries. Decisions would be taken locally by strong, elected local authorities.

If anyone doubted the scope for savings which abolition would bring, let them consider the GLC's spending record: its £10 million propaganda campaign; its women's committee which spent three times the budget of the Equal Opportunities Commission; and its forays into foreign policy. The GLC and the metropolitan counties together were planning to exceed the Government's targets by more than £400 million. Their budgets exceeded their grant-related expenditure by £600 million. There was plenty of scope for the successor authorities to make savings.

Opposition Views

Dr John Cunningham, the chief official Opposition spokesman on the environment, said that since 1979 the Government had consistently undermined local government, transferred powers to non-elected – sometimes closed – boards, given ministers more and stronger controls, and given voters less say and less control over their own communities and services. Those shifts had diminished the quality as well as the quantity of public provision, and had added to unemployment and inefficiency.

None of the claims made for the Bill could withstand a cursory examination. As regards the claim that the proposals would simplify local government and return powers to the boroughs and districts, in reality what was proposed was that the functions of each elected metropolitan county should be dispersed to more than one dozen different bodies – all non-elected. Nor was it true that an unnecessary tier of local government was being removed. Indeed, the Government's own proposals confirmed the need for a strategic tier as they were keeping many of the services at a countywide level but simply removing them from democratic control. A change in the nature of the administration was now being proposed, not a change by removing administration.

The most likely outcome of the proposals would be an increase in costs to ratepayers or a reduction in services. In addition the Bill gave wide-ranging and important powers to ministers, providing more than 40 new powers, many of which were unprecedented. The Bill left unresolved the future administration and support of policies for sport, recreation and leisure, the future of enterprise board policies and the crucial issue of support for voluntary organisations. The work of the councils for equal opportunities, ethnic minorities, industry and employment would also be undermined by the Bill.

Mr Simon Hughes, the Liberal Party spokesman on the environment, said that his party had argued consistently for regional government throughout Britain, including London, and, at the lowest possible level, a single tier of local government for local services. He said that the Bill sought to abolish the metropolitan counties, but offered no proper democratic regional structure in their place. The argument that there would be savings had certainly not been proven. There would be more central control, not less, more muddle and less clarity. The Bill provided no guarantees for many voluntary organisations in the seven counties. The economic development needed for the deprived, less well-supported areas would no longer be provided in the absence of the agencies that at present were at least trying to co-ordinate what was being done for the economy and infrastructure of urban centres. The result of the Bill would be fragmentation of local government.

Speaking for the Social Democratic Party, Mr John Cartwright said that, through the various appointed bodies and joint boards, the Bill would retain a two-tier system of local government, in which the upper tier would not be directly accountable. In addition, the sweeping powers which the Bill gave ministers to introduce statutory instruments amounted to a third tier in Whitehall, whose powers were immensely strengthened by the Bill.

He believed that there should be one tier of local government in which boroughs and districts carried out genuinely local powers and provided genuinely local services, and a wider tier of elected government responsible for the powers, duties and functions that must be carried out across a city region – powers for major planning, economic development, transport, fire services and major leisure and recreational facilities. Such regional bodies would have the ability to pull powers down from Whitehall closer to ordinary people.

Government Reply

Replying for the Government, the Minister for Local Government, Mr Kenneth Baker, referred to the criticism made of the Bill's 'enormous and sweeping powers'. He argued that the proposed powers were no more wide and sweeping than had been provided by local government legislation in 1963 and 1972. Nearly all local government legislation had to be framed with order-making powers to transfer functions and responsibilities or properties. As for the claims that there was a centralising force in the legislation, the purpose of the Bill was to devolve responsibilities. In answer to the argument that the proposed legislation would devolve little to the lower tier, Mr Baker enumerated 30 subject areas in which, under the Bill, responsibilities would be transferred to the metropolitan districts.

Emergency Provisions in Northern Ireland

The Government's response to the review of the operation of the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 by the late Sir George Baker was outlined by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland in a debate in the House of Commons on 20 December 1984. In the light of views expressed in the debate and after further discussions with interested parties in Northern Ireland the Secretary of State will submit proposals for changes in the law to Parliament. Following the debate an Order renewing the emergency provisions for a further six months was approved.

Sir George Baker was asked to undertake his review (which was published in April 1984 – see pp 156-7, 1984) to determine whether the provisions of the legislation 'strike the right balance between the need on the one hand to maintain as fully as possible the liberties of the individual and on the other to provide the security forces and the courts with adequate powers to enable them to protect the public from current and foreseeable incidence of terrorist crime'. The present Act gives the police and armed forces special powers of arrest, search and seizure. It provides for trial by a judge sitting alone for persons accused of specific scheduled offences and in such cases imposes stricter than normal bail conditions. It also enables the Secretary of State to proscribe organisations engaging in terrorist activities. Its provisions must be renewed every six months.

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATE

Secretary of State's Speech

Opening the debate (*Hansard*, Vol 70, No 33, cols 575-650) the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr Douglas Hurd, said that Sir George Baker's conclusions had to be looked at against the background of the present security situation. It was hard to strike the correct balance between protecting life and prosperity and protecting civil liberties in a free society that is plagued by terrorism. The Government broadly agreed with both the tone of the report and its conclusions.

The Government's aim was to eradicate terrorism and to restore peace and normality. There were, of course, relationships between the security problem, the need for political development and the economic situation. The most pressing problem was the continuing violence which placed a major constraint on political development and inhibited investment and prosperity. The lack of political agreement in Northern Ireland added to instability and might well help the terrorists through hindering the support of the security forces from each part of the community. Equally, unemployment led to enforced idleness and discontent which could be exploited by the paramilitary organisations. Progress had to be sought on all fronts if peace, stability and prosperity were to be achieved.

In a free, open and democratic society terrorism was best countered by the resolute application of the criminal law, continued Mr Hurd. Powers of arrest, court procedures and treatment in prison should be as standard as was practicable. Suspected terrorists should be charged and brought before courts whose independence could not be questioned, where the rules of evidence applied and where fundamental safeguards for defendants were maintained.

Security had undoubtedly improved since the early 1970s. But the Government was faced with a ruthless and sophisticated enemy which continued to have access to recruits, money, arms and explosives. In recent years the Royal Ulster Constabulary had trebled in size and expanded its capabilities enormously. The police were now able to do work which had previously fallen to the Army. The Government recognised that policing a divided community was a highly sensitive task, particularly when the police had at the same time to counter a vicious terrorist campaign supported by a sophisticated propaganda machine. The Royal Ulster Constabulary had the will to enforce the law even-handedly and in the interests of the whole community. They recognised that effective policing depended on establishing links with the community and building a fund of trust and goodwill. Behind the police stood the Army, providing military support in certain areas and in certain operations; an invaluable contribution was made by the Ulster Defence Regiment. The men and women of the Northern Ireland prison service should also be remembered; they had faced

protest action within the prisons and attacks upon them outside. The co-operation received from the security forces in the Republic of Ireland was crucial in bringing about the defeat of terrorism and should be strengthened.

Response to the Review

Turning to the review, Mr Hurd said that Sir George Baker had concluded that there was a continuing need for emergency powers; the Northern Ireland Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights had reached a similar conclusion. Having scrutinised the Act in the light of Sir George's recommendations Mr Hurd said he believed there was some scope for making changes which would reflect developments in the security situation and strike more precisely the right balance between individual liberties and the need to give the security forces and courts adequate powers to deal with terrorism.

A number of the review's recommendations aimed to bring the emergency provisions more closely in line with the ordinary law and in general he regarded them sympathetically, including the recommendations for the rationalisation of police arrest powers. He subscribed, too, to the principles that underlay the recommendations for increasing the scope of the Attorney-General's discretion to certify particular offences out of the non-jury mode of trial. He had not yet reached a conclusion on certain other recommendations concerning the granting of bail and the admissibility of statements.

Sir George had raised the important question whether there was still need for the provision for detention without trial, contained – although no longer in force – in the Act. Mr Hurd said he was tempted to agree to its repeal but it might not be prudent to remove a reserve power which could be needed in a sudden short-term crisis occurring, for example, when Parliament was in recess.

Mr Hurd said he shared Sir George's concern that delays in the judicial process should be kept to a minimum. He would watch with interest the field trials to be conducted in England and Wales into the practicability and effectiveness of time limits between remand and trial (see p 335, 1984). He was pleased to announce that the Lord Chancellor had agreed to the appointment of an additional county court judge.

Referring to the use of accomplice evidence Mr Hurd pointed out that Sir George Baker had affirmed that the use of such evidence did not deprive the accused of a fair trial. In October 1983 the Attorney-General had made a statement about accomplice evidence in which he said that if such evidence appeared credible and cogent and related to serious terrorist crime, there was an overriding public interest in having charges brought before the court. It was then for the court to decide whether the evidence reached the standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt. If a court rejected accomplice evidence in a particular case, it did not mean that the decision to prosecute was wrong. Sir George had suggested that in trials involving accomplice evidence the number of defendants should be kept at 20 or less. The Government would look at this issue, but Mr Hurd said he was not convinced that trying a number of defendants simultaneously affected the standard of justice or caused undue delay. On the question of single-judge courts Mr Hurd said that in the present circumstances a return could not be made to jury trials for the worst terrorist offences. But it would be possible to take an increased proportion of trials out of the scheduled non-jury procedure.

Finally Sir George had dealt with the police complaints procedure. A clear and trusted system for handling complaints against the police was an important safeguard for the citizen and, in the long run, for the police, said Mr Hurd. This was particularly the case in a divided community. Under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 there was a new independent police complaints authority in England and Wales which had the duty of supervising the investigation of complaints against the police (see p 390, 1983). He was considering how similar changes could be introduced in Northern Ireland.

Mr Hurd said the Government was determined to support the security forces, the prison service and the judiciary which protected the human rights and liberty of the people of Northern Ireland, and which were subject to ferocious propaganda attacks if a mistake or momentary misjudgement occurred. In ensuring that individual rights were protected there was a danger of endorsing the propaganda campaigns of those interested not in the liberty of the individual but in discrediting and overthrowing the institutions of the rule of law. The Government had to ensure that differences in law intended to take account of the different circumstances of Northern Ireland were kept to a minimum, that there was machinery for dealing with complaints as quickly and fairly as possible and that the institutions were so designed and administered that they served the genuine interests of all who lived in Northern Ireland.

Opposition Views

The chief official Opposition spokesman on Northern Ireland, Mr Peter Archer, said that the Government could have accepted Sir George Baker's recommendations at once without endangering security. Opposition members believed that the strongest base from which to maintain law and order was a community which supported law enforcement and opposed lawbreaking. That was achieved by demonstrating that those concerned with law enforcement displayed constant respect for the rules and that the rules were manifestly fair. The question was about what departures from normality were necessary. If they were not necessary, they were counterproductive and if they were not required to protect, they served only to alienate. A survey by the Cobden Trust had shown that 90 per cent of those arrested under emergency legislation failed to be the subject of charges and that 72 per cent of those held under such legislation were not even questioned about specific offences. Mr Archer expressed his disquiet about several aspects of accomplice trials and said that if they were discontinued, the gains in terms of restoring confidence to the community would substantially

outweigh the possibility of convicting people against whom there was no other evidence. Part of creating an atmosphere for political progress was to remove the sense of grievance and the feeling that things were not being done fairly.

Mr Alex Carlile, speaking for the Liberal Party, said that it was regrettable that Sir George Baker was not asked to investigate whether temporary emergency legislation was effective or even necessary. While at present he accepted the need for this type of legislation, the absence of any independent monitoring of its operation was a matter of anxiety.

The Secretary of State was deluding himself if he thought that trials with more than 20 defendants produced justice. There was no justification for holding non-jury trials in cases with no terrorist connection. He hoped that when the Secretary of State produced legislation, it would give effect to all the Baker recommendations.

Views of Northern Ireland Members

The Reverend Ian Paisley, leader of the Democratic Unionist Party, said that the fact that emergency legislation was necessary was an indictment of the security policies of successive British governments which had failed to deal effectively with the IRA and the Irish National Liberation Army. Membership of Sinn Fein and the IRA was interchangeable and he regretted that Sir George Baker had not recommended the proscription of Sinn Fein. Great anxiety was caused in both parts of the community by the excessive periods that many prisoners were forced to spend in custody; every effort should be made to avoid long delays between arrest and trial. There was opposition on both sides of the religious divide to the 'supergrass' system. In cases where an informer had been given a substantial inducement to give evidence the court should not convict unless there was corroboration by other evidence.

Mr Ken Maginnis, Official Unionist member, said that the Secretary of State should bear in mind the dangers facing law-abiding citizens; members speaking in the debate would forget the dangers faced by members of the security forces. It was to them, not the biased minority, that the House should direct its attention. Many Roman Catholics were law-abiding citizens and were, as much as anyone, victims of IRA terrorism. It was to law-abiding citizens rather than vocal fellow-travellers of the IRA that the Secretary of State owed the first consideration if and when he amended the emergency legislation in line with Sir George Baker's recommendations.

Mr John Hume, leader of the Social Democratic and Labour Party, said that the search for law and order was the search for political consensus. When there was no such consensus to produce peace and stability, the law was bent and stretched. When that happened, there was a grave danger of promoting those who wanted to destroy the rule of law. People agreed to be governed so that they might have a system of order. Tragically, there was disagreement about that in Northern Ireland, which was at the root of all the problems. He believed that there should be no immutable principles to stand in the way of examining how to produce an agreed manner in which the people of the island of Ireland could live together. Only then would the sort of law and order that every member wanted be achieved.

RENEWAL OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS

After the debate on Sir George Baker's review of the operation of the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 an Order authorising its continuance for a further six months was approved by 159 votes to 37 (*Hansard*, Vol 70, No 34, cols 651-72). Moving the motion for approval Mr Nicholas Scott, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Northern Ireland Office, said that the Government would now proceed to make proposals for amending the legislation in the light of comments made during the earlier debate and of representations by the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights and other interested parties in Northern Ireland. In reminding the House of the provisions of the Act, Mr Scott said that it did not alter the central principles of British justice: that the onus remained on the prosecution to prove guilt beyond reasonable doubt; that accused persons had the opportunity to take legal advice and be legally represented in open court; and that there was a right of appeal against conviction or sentence on matters both of law and fact.

Britain and East-West Relations

The need for peace and for building confidence between East and West was reaffirmed by the British Government in talks with a Soviet delegation, led by Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, and in a speech by the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, in West Berlin in December 1984. Discussions on arms control took place between the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, and the United States President, Mr Ronald Reagan, in Washington on 22 December. At talks in Geneva on 7 and 8 January, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to resume negotiations on arms control.

Mr Gorbachev's Visit

The Soviet delegation, which arrived in Britain on 15 December 1984, was led by Mr Gorbachev, a member of the Soviet Communist Party's Political Bureau and a secretary of its Central Committee. It also included Mr Leonid Zamyatin, head of the Central Committee's International Information Department.

On 16 December the Prime Minister had discussions at Chequers with Mr Gorbachev and other members of the delegation. In a television interview the following day, Mrs Thatcher said that, although British and Soviet leaders believed in their own political systems, both countries could do business together and had a common interest in ensuring that war never started again and that disarmament talks succeeded. This was more likely to happen if both countries could build up confidence and trust. Britain believed in co-operation on trade and cultural matters and in contacts between politicians from both sides. She was therefore pleased that Mr Gorbachev had come to Britain and hoped that the visit would be successful.

Both the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, Mrs Thatcher said, required a balance of armaments if both were to feel secure. It did not make sense to have balance at a higher and higher level of armaments. The West wanted to get the level of balance down and this required a resumption of disarmament talks (see p 12).

At a lunch given in Mr Gorbachev's honour at Hampton Court on 17 December, Sir Geoffrey Howe said that East-West relations was one of the British Government's major preoccupations, since the subject impinged on Britain's security, future and prosperity with greater effect than any other single aspect of foreign policy. In spite of their differences, both Britain and the Soviet Union recognised that they lived on the same planet and this compelled them to get down to the business of living together in the most constructive way possible, in mutual respect, and in awareness of each other's legitimate interests. Observing that the European Community had been founded with a view to preventing war between European states by breaking down barriers and encouraging the free flow of trade and people, Sir Geoffrey said that Britain wanted to see an increase in trading, political and other links of all kinds between Western and Eastern Europe.

Britain and the Soviet Union, Sir Geoffrey continued, had both experienced the horrors of war and, after 40 years of peace in Europe, both shared a determination that war and its terrible destruction should not be allowed to happen again. The British Government wanted to see the reduction of tension and fewer weapons. Economic commonsense alone argued that there were better ways to proceed than to go on living with armaments at their present levels. Pressures to release money spent on defence for more constructive investment were increased by the awesome responsibilities flowing from the possession of nuclear weapons. 'We in the West need no more reminding of the uniquely terrible destruction such weapons can wreak than you do in the East. There can be no real winners in a nuclear conflict. So we share an urgent and common interest in working together to find ways to reduce our dependence on large nuclear forces [and] to preserve security but at less risk and at lower cost.'

Yet progress in arms control negotiations had been frustratingly small, principally because of the absence of confidence between the two sides. This could, however, be built through the better mutual understanding that could arise from more frequent contact between East and West and through the certainty that each side would act in the way it said it would. Britain hoped that the Geneva arms control talks would be 'just the first of many steps along the path towards greater East-West confidence and security at reduced levels of weapons'.

Sir Geoffrey also emphasised the need, in accordance with the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, for much freer contact between people and

families throughout Western and Eastern Europe. Relations between governments could only be of limited depth if there were no relations between individuals to support them.

Mr Gorbachev's Views

In response Mr Gorbachev said that the Soviet leadership attached great importance to the planned United States-Soviet talks in Geneva. The Soviet Union was prepared to look for and work out radical solutions to allow an advance to the complete prohibition and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. Mr Gorbachev stressed the importance of preventing the arms race from spreading to space, since it was unrealistic to hope for its end unless this goal was achieved.

On 18 December Mr Gorbachev told members of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee that there was no rational alternative to the policy of peaceful co-existence. The Soviet Union wanted a broad dialogue and to develop equal and mutually advantageous co-operation in resolving political problems, in economic matters, in science and technology, and in the promotion of cultural relations and exchanges. It was ready to develop vigorously Soviet-British relations over a wide variety of questions and Mr Gorbachev hoped that his visit would promote co-operation in the interests of the two countries and those of mutual understanding and peace in the world at large.

Sir Geoffrey Howe's Berlin Speech

Speaking in Berlin on 10 December, Sir Geoffrey Howe noted that, despite efforts made since 1945 for a more constructive relationship between East and West, there was still an armed peace between the two sides. This had in recent years been both a tense and sterile condition as well as being an increasingly expensive one. Although NATO had maintained peace by resolve and readiness for defence and would go on doing so as long as required, the present state of East-West relations was unwelcome and fundamentally absurd because of the missed opportunities for progress that could have been seized for the benefit of all parts of Europe and the entire world. The West wanted a truer peace which was not just absence of war but which had a more positive content. 'We must neither fight each other nor ignore each other. We must open ourselves to each other: and to the idea of working together. This is not a vision for Western Europe alone. It can and must involve the whole of Europe . . . . Stability and peace in the world at large will be difficult to achieve so long as division and armed confrontation are the general order of the day in Europe.'

Britain's approach to East-West relations, continued Sir Geoffrey, was both practical and ambitious. Although ideological differences existed and East and West would simply not agree on some matters, there were real and substantial areas of common interest. The desire to avoid war was universal, as was the economic logic of seeking, through arms control, a balance at a lower level of armaments. The words in which both sides defined their aims were often the same. 'The problem lies in differing meanings, reflecting conflicting concepts of national interest, mutual failures of understanding, and mutual lack of trust.' This gap between word and deed had to be addressed. The political dialogue with the East needed to be as varied and as wide as possible. 'Its value lies partly in its content, and partly in helping us to know each other better. We must step up our human contacts, and our cultural exchange. No one with any historical sense can accept the notion that European identity and European values stop dead at the iron curtain in the middle of Europe.' Britain and Russia had been in contact for centuries and there was often a good economic, as well as cultural, logic to these links. Economic co-operation – within the obvious limits of security – was also necessary to exploit potential areas of mutual benefit.

Prime Minister's Visit to the United States

Mrs Thatcher visited Washington for talks with President Reagan on 22 December. At a press conference that day, the Prime Minister explained that she and President Reagan had had a very thorough discussion about the prospects for arms control negotiations and the United States Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI),[1] and that both had seen matters in very much the same light. She had told the President that she had made it absolutely clear to Mr Gorbachev that there was no question of the Soviet Union being able to divide Britain from the United States on these matters. Britain agreed that the SDI research programme, permitted under existing United States-Soviet treaties, should go ahead, since the Soviet Union had its own programme which had, in the view of the United States, already gone beyond research.

Mrs Thatcher said that she and the President had agreed on four specific points: that the United States and Western aim was not to achieve superiority, but to maintain balance, taking account of Soviet developments; that SDI-related deployment would, in view of treaty obligations, have to be a matter for negotiations; that the overall aim was to enhance, and not to undermine, deterrence; and that East-West negotiation should aim to achieve security with reduced levels of offensive systems on both sides.

In answer to questions, Mrs Thatcher pointed out that the Soviet Union had already obtained an anti-satellite capability and had done a great deal of research on lasers and electronic pulse beams. It was necessary, therefore, 'to embark upon a process of research on these matters . . . in order for the United States to keep balance and not to let the Soviet Union get ahead . . .'. Although research was within existing agreements, decisions to go ahead with production and deployment had to be a matter for negotiation, since both the United States and the Soviet Union were bound by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the

[1]In March 1983 President Reagan announced his decision to embark upon a research programme, known as the Strategic Defence Initiative (often referred to as 'Star Wars'), aimed at eliminating the threat posed by nuclear armed ballistic missiles by intercepting and destroying them at various stages during their flight. The United States believes that the SDI will strengthen deterrence and lead to a lowering of the level of nuclear forces.

1967 treaty concerning military activity in outer space.[1] She did not believe that the United States had any intention of breaching its treaty obligations.

THE GENEVA ARMS CONTROL TALKS

On 22 November the United States and the Soviet Union announced that they would enter into new negotiations with the objective of reaching mutually acceptable agreements on the whole range of questions concerning nuclear arms and weapons in outer space. Accordingly the United States Secretary of State, Mr George Schultz, and the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr Andrei Gromyko, met in Geneva for discussions on 7 and 8 January. They agreed to resume arms control negotiations at a date to be set within a month.

In their joint statement issued on 8 January both sides agreed that the objective of the negotiations would be 'to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and at strengthening strategic stability'. The negotiations will be conducted by a delegation from each side, divided into three groups dealing respectively with space weapons, intermediate-range nuclear weapons, and strategic nuclear weapons. The statement concluded: 'The sides believe that ultimately the forthcoming negotiation, just as efforts in general to limit and reduce arms, should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere.'

On 9 January, President Reagan's National Security Adviser, Mr Robert McFarlane, reported to the Prime Minister on the outcome of the talks. Mrs Thatcher warmly welcomed the Geneva agreement and assured Mr McFarlane of Britain's continued support for the United States in the negotiations.

Speaking in a radio interview on 9 January, Mr Malcolm Rifkind, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, expressed pleasure that the two superpowers were now talking and he hoped that serious and constructive discussions would take place in the very near future. The talks had been made possible by improvements in the political atmosphere, and the very substantial contacts which had taken place between British ministers and Soviet leaders in the past few months had played a part in this. Nevertheless, although the whole atmosphere was now more constructive, no dramatic breakthroughs would occur in the next few weeks or months. 'The real serious negotiations have now to begin and they are going to take a long time because there are real issues to be resolved, there are real differences in perception and in capability that exist in the world and that is going to require a long time to make real progress.'

Asked about Britain's nuclear weapons, Mr Rifkind said that the negotiations were concerned with achieving a proper balance between the two superpowers who possessed the vast proportion of all the world's nuclear weapons and that Britain's nuclear arsenal would therefore not be discussed.

[1]The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty prohibits the development, testing or deployment of those ABM systems and components that are space-, air- or sea-based, or mobile land-based. The Treaty permits research but not field testing of a prototype ABM system or component. The 1967 treaty states that outer space and celestial bodies, including the moon, are to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that the parties should not place nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit round the earth or otherwise station them in outer space or on celestial bodies. The treaty does not prohibit the passage through space of nuclear armed ballistic missiles nor does it cover anti-satellite warfare.

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

Member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) have reaffirmed that deterrence and defence, combined with arms control and disarmament and constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union and its allies, are integral parts of a coherent policy for stable peace.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

The following communiqué[1] (slightly abridged, with headings added) was issued by the North Atlantic Council after its meeting in Brussels on 13 and 14 December 1984:

East-West Relations

The last few years have been difficult ones for East-West relations. The difficulties have not been of our making. In particular, the constant Soviet build-up of arms of all kinds requires us to maintain adequate forces to guarantee our collective security and to preserve the peace. The Alliance has continued to show strength and political solidarity, which remain the basis for our security.

The principles of the 'Washington Statement on East-West Relations' of May 1984 [see pp 207-8, 1984], *which reaffirms our commitment to the Harmel Report, continue to guide the Alliance. Deterrence and defence, combined with arms control and disarmament, as well as constructive dialogue with the East, are for us integral parts of a coherent policy for stable peace. We remain ready to play our full part in a realistic effort to bring about an improved East-West relationship and increased co-operation. Regular bilateral high-level contacts can contribute to these objectives. We call upon the Soviet Union and its allies to adopt a similarly positive approach towards genuine détente.*

We will maintain our close consultations on all matters of common concern. As we approach what may be a new phase in the arms control process, consultations on arms control and disarmament remain of particular importance.

Nuclear Weapons

We welcome the forthcoming meeting of Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Gromyko to discuss new negotiations on the whole range of questions concerning intercontinental and intermediate-range nuclear weapons and arms in outer space [see above].

[1]As on previous occasions, Spain reserved its position on the communiqué.

Nuclear weapons should be substantially reduced by negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union leading to equitable, verifiable and balanced agreements in which all concerned can have confidence.

The Allies concerned are willing to reverse, halt or modify the Longer Range INF [intermediate nuclear forces] *deployments* [see pp 419-20, 1983] *– including the removal and dismantling of missiles already deployed – upon achievement of a balanced, equitable and verifiable agreement calling for such action. In the absence of a concrete negotiated result obviating the need for such deployment, the Allies concerned emphasised their determination to continue the deployment of longer-range INF missiles as scheduled.*[1]

Chemical Weapons

The best approach to the problem of chemical weapons is the most radical: they should be eliminated world-wide. We remain deeply concerned about the use of such weapons. We call on the international community to work for the objective of a verifiable, comprehensive and global ban on chemical weapons. We attach high priority to the efforts to achieve this objective at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva [see pp 79-80, 1984].

Confidence and Security

Confidence and security are complementary. In Stockholm [at the Conference on Confidence and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe], *we seek agreement on militarily significant and concrete confidence and security building measures to be applied in the whole of Europe thereby giving new effect and expression to the existing duty of all participating states to refrain from the threat or use of force* [see pp 48-9, 1984]. *In Vienna, the Allies participating in the MBFR* [Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions] *negotiations are actively working towards a verifiable agreement involving reductions of conventional forces to parity at lower levels, thereby enhancing confidence and improving military stability in Europe.*

We remain firmly committed to the balanced development of the CSCE [Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe] *process. The experts' meeting on human rights which will take place in Ottawa in May 1985 will be one important step in this process. Full implementation by all participating states of the political undertakings made in Helsinki and Madrid* [see pp 324-8, 1983] *is essential. The tenth anniversary of the signing of the Final Act in August 1985 should be commemorated by a meeting of the participating states at political level, on the assumption that the international climate would make this appropriate. The CSCE process could thereby receive a new impulse.*

Other Issues

It is unacceptable that the Soviet Union, in disregard of its obligation not to threaten or use force, continues to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan [see pp 14-16].

[1]Denmark and Greece reserved their positions on this paragraph.

Other issues also remain of deep concern to us. Recent events in Poland again demonstrate the need to achieve national reconciliation.

We, for our part, respect the sovereignty and independence of all states. We will remain vigilant and will consult on events outside the Treaty area which might threaten our common security.

The maintenance of a calm situation in and around Berlin remains an essential element in East-West relations. In this regard unimpeded traffic on all access routes is of fundamental importance.

We support the efforts of the Federal Republic of Germany to continue and develop dialogue and co-operation with the German Democratic Republic as a contribution to strengthening peace in Europe and to obtain further practical improvements to benefit the German people, particularly the Berliners. On the question of the division of Germany, we reaffirm our Washington Statement of 31 May 1984.

We seek to improve the quality of the peace. As a community of free nations sharing common values, we remain fully committed to strengthening free institutions and to promoting stability, well-being and economic co-operation, in the spirit of Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

We remain determined to prevent and suppress terrorism, which seeks to undermine stability and destroy our democratic institutions.

The continued expansion of Soviet military potential remains a major Allied concern. We are therefore determined to maintain a sufficient level of both conventional and nuclear forces to ensure the credibility of deterrence. Those Allies participating in the military structure of the Alliance will work in particular to strengthen their conventional capabilities.

The security we seek for ourselves is not security at the expense of the Soviet Union or any one else. None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack. Our Alliance is designed to prevent war and to preserve peace in freedom . . .

DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting in Brussels on 4 and 5 December, NATO's Defence Planning Committee[1] also expressed concern regarding the steady growth of Warsaw Pact capabilities, and reaffirmed NATO's determination to do everything possible to enhance the flexibility and credibility of the strategy of flexible response by maintaining an effective nuclear deterrent and through the strengthening of NATO's conventional forces.

The Committee also agreed that redressing the steadily growing conventional imbalance favouring the Warsaw Pact was necessary to strengthen deterrence and to reduce dependence on the early use of nuclear weapons. It welcomed recent progress in improving conventional forces, notably a doubling of funds for infrastructure projects, improvements in the state of ammunition stocks, the continued exploitation of new technology (including the co-ordination of research, development and procurement in Europe), and a greater

[1]The Spanish defence minister reserved his position on the communiqué.

emphasis on long-term planning. They agreed that further proposals to improve conventional defence should be developed, particularly with regard to the harmonisation of national efforts and the co-ordination of defence procurement.

NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP

The NATO Nuclear Planning Group, meeting in Stresa, Italy, on 11 and 12 October, supported the determination of the United States and Britain to maintain the deterrent capabilities of their strategic forces and expressed concern at the unabated Soviet build-up at all levels. In the strategic field the Soviet Union was pressing ahead with the development and testing of a wide range of new systems, including two intercontinental ballistic missiles, a new submarine-launched ballistic missile, a new bomber and a new generation of ground-, air-, and sea-launched cruise missiles which were expected to enter service in the near future. New bases for SS20 missiles were also under construction east and west of the Ural mountains. Older shorter-range missiles were being replaced by a new generation of more accurate systems and modern SS21 and SS22 missiles were being deployed in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. The SS23 missile had also been developed and tested. These Soviet measures were the fruit of programmes instituted before NATO's 1979 decision to deploy cruise and Pershing II missiles. In contrast, notes the Committee's communiqué, NATO had started to implement its 1983 decision to reduce its nuclear stockpile to the lowest level in the past 20 years (see pp 419-20, 1983), since it wished to maintain only the minimum number of nuclear weapons necessary for deterrence. In the absence of a negotiated agreement the deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles would continue as scheduled, and for each such missile deployed, another warhead would be removed. These deployments could be reversed, halted or removed upon the achievement of a balanced, equitable and verifiable agreement calling for such action.[1]

EUROGROUP

The European contribution to allied defence was discussed at the Eurogroup meeting in Brussels on 3 and 4 December. In a communiqué, defence ministers pointed out that the standing forces of the European allies numbered more than 3 million, which would increase to nearly 7 million on mobilisation, while their defence expenditure had been expanding for well over a decade at an average rate of over 2 per cent a year in real terms. They agreed that greater attempts were needed to obtain the best value for money and noted that significant improvements were underway in the provision of warstocks, particularly ammunition, and infrastructure. Effective collaboration in the research, development, production and maintenance of defence equipment could also make a significant contribution to the Alliance's defences.

An annexe to the communiqué describes some of the major equipment acquisitions and improvements planned for 1985 by Eurogroup countries participating in NATO's integrated military structure. Land forces are to be strengthened by the introduction of some 740 main battle tanks, and well over 600 other armoured vehicles and 140 heavy and field artillery pieces will enter service. Improvements in anti-armour capability will include 850 guns, 300 missile launchers of the Milan and TOW type, and 3,000 man-portable anti-tank rocket-launchers.

Well over 300 new aircraft, most being combat aircraft, are planned to be introduced in 1985, while air defence will be enhanced by the introduction of tankers and airborne early-warning aircraft. Aircraft survivability will be increased by improving electronic countermeasures equipment and radar warning systems and the fitting of new decoy and chaff dispensers.

At sea Eurogroup members expect to introduce one aircraft-carrier, five escorts and destroyers, 13 mine-warfare vessels, a fleet-support vessel and a submarine. Existing vessels and weapons will continue to be upgraded and warships are being fitted with advanced sensors, radars and sonors and with better electronic countermeasures and communications equipment. In addition almost 50 new aircraft will enter service in a maritime role.

[1]Greece expressed its views in a statement included in the minutes; Denmark reserved its position on the part concerning intermediate-range missiles.

Afghanistan

On the fifth anniversary in December 1984 of the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, the British Government condemned the Soviet action and stressed the need for an end to the occupation.

BRITISH VIEWS

In a statement issued on 27 December 1984, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office said that it was now five years since Afghanistan had been invaded by the Soviet Union. The Afghan people, who were victims of a relentless and brutal war, continued to suffer. Tens of thousands had died or suffered atrocious injuries, and hunger and disease afflicted those displaced by the fighting. Many villages had been razed to the ground and each day hundreds fled the country to join the millions already being given refuge in Pakistan and Iran. Soviet troops, which now numbered over 100,000 and which alone kept the Babrak Karmal regime in power, had failed to prevent the Afghan resistance carrying its fight for independence into every province and, in 1984, into the streets of the capital, Kabul. This struggle against overwhelming odds had earned the resistance the admiration of people throughout the world.

Noting that in November 1984 the United Nations General Assembly had voted overwhelmingly, and by a record majority, for a resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops, the statement concluded: 'The British Government supports the continuing efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General to reach an internationally acceptable settlement based on principles defined in successive United Nations General Assembly resolutions. We admire the Government of Pakistan's principled commitment to the success of these negotiations. But progress will not be possible until the Soviet Union agrees to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan. Only then will the suffering of the Afghan people end.'

In a radio interview broadcast by the BBC World Service on 27 December 1984, the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, said that the continued occupation of Afghanistan was an impediment to good relations between the West and the Soviet Union and between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, as shown by the condemnation of the occupation by a growing and massive majority in the United Nations. The fifth anniversary of the Soviet Union's invasion provided an opportunity of underlining the importance of its continued occupation which was causing great suffering to the people of Afghanistan. 'We ought to be doing everything we can to try and promote the withdrawal of Soviet troops. One way is by keeping up pressure at the United Nations. Another is by drawing attention to our awareness of the real suffering of the Afghan people . . . .' Whenever British government ministers saw Soviet leaders, they pressed upon them the strength of the case for withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Concluding, Sir Geoffrey pointed out that the pressure of world opinion had been maintained and those in a position to act, like Pakistan, had been maintaining their courage. In demonstrating their resistance the Afghan people were better and more widely organised, but in the talks on a possible settlement (see below) the Soviet Union had not given any sign of willingness to agree to a timetable for withdrawal. Noting that talks were to resume again in February under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General, Sir Geoffrey hoped that the Soviet Union would begin to show some signs of willingness to yield. The outlook, however, was not encouraging.

BACKGROUND

The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979 and established the present Karmal regime (see pp 15-18, 1980); since then armed resistance has continued and millions of refugees have fled to neighbouring countries, mainly Pakistan.

The United Nations General Assembly has voted on six occasions for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan, most recently in November 1984 when it also called for a negotiated settlement which would permit the restoration of Afghanistan's independence and non-aligned status, allow its people to express their right to self-determination, and enable the Afghan refugees to return to their homes in safety. There were 119 votes in favour, including Britain, and 20 against, with 14 countries abstaining.

During the debate, which took place between 13 and 15 November, a joint statement made to the General Assembly by the ten member states of the European Community pointed out that the overwhelming majority of the international community had rejected the Soviet Union's attempts to impose a regime on the Afghan people by force. The Community member states' continuing concern at the situation in Afghanistan was also expressed in a joint communiqué issued in Dublin on 16 November 1984 at the end of a meeting of Community foreign ministers and those of the Association of South-East Asian Nations. This expressed deep concern that the Soviet Union was still occupying a traditionally neutral and non-aligned country, deplored the suffering and hardships inflicted on the Afghan people by the extensive shelling and bombing of civilian areas, and stressed the urgent need to seek a just and lasting solution that would ensure the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops and the restoration of Afghanistan's independence and non-aligned status. The foreign ministers also regretted that all appeals by the United Nations, the Islamic Conference and the movement of non-aligned countries for a withdrawal of Soviet troops and a comprehensive settlement had gone unheeded by the Soviet Union.

The Organisation of the Islamic Conference suspended Afghanistan's membership early in 1980 because of the Soviet Union's invasion. In January 1984 the Islamic Conference's fourth summit meeting, attended by 44 Islamic leaders, reaffirmed its deep concern over the Soviet military intervention and again called for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces.

Attempts have been made by successive United Nations Secretaries-General to find a solution to the problem caused by the Soviet occupation. In early 1981 the then Secretary-General, Dr Kurt Waldheim, appointed Señor Pérez de Cuéllar as his personal representative with the task of promoting a political settlement. When Señor Pérez de Cuéllar became Secretary-General, he appointed Señor Diego Cordovez to take over this task. Señor Cordovez drew up four elements for discussion, namely troop withdrawal, non-interference in Afghanistan, international guarantees of a final settlement, and return of the refugees. Although several rounds of talks have taken place between Pakistan and the Karmal regime, no settlement has been reached and the Soviet Union has refused to give an undertaking to withdraw within a specific timetable agreeable to all the parties concerned. Instead it has insisted that withdrawal can only take place after guarantees have been given of non-intervention and the ending of alleged 'external interference' from Pakistan, Iran and the West.

The United Nations has also shown its concern for human rights in Afghanistan by the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, approved by the Economic and Social Council in May 1984, that a rapporteur should be appointed to prepare a comprehensive report on abuses.

British initiative

Britain has contributed directly to the search for a settlement through the proposals made for an international conference on Afghanistan launched on behalf of the European Community in June 1981 (see pp 201-2, 1981). These proposals gained the support of some 70 non-European Community countries and the British Government continues to regard them as a realistic and practicable means towards promoting a political settlement.

Afghan Refugees

Since 1980 some 4 million people (a fifth of the Afghan population) have fled the country, mostly to the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, where there are now some 350 camps jointly administered by the Government of Pakistan and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Other refugees are in camps in Baluchistan and a few in the Punjab. A large proportion are women and children. The problem has been described by the UNHCR as 'the largest single refugee situation in the world today'. In addition to its general relief programme the UNHCR has appointed the World Bank to administer special income-generating projects, the aim being to provide employment and income for the refugees and to create viable economic assets for Pakistan.

Britain has given humanitarian aid worth £25 million since 1980 to assist the refugees, some through European Community programmes. Although the bulk of this aid has gone to the UNHCR's relief programmes, some has been allocated as contributions to the work of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross Societies, the British Red Cross, Christian Aid, Oxfam, and the Save the Children Fund. Nearly £2 million of the aid allocated to the UNHCR has gone to the special United Nations–World Bank income-generating projects. There is also a scheme to provide scholarships for Afghan refugees to come to Britain for training, mainly at university level.

The most recent major British contribution to assist the refugees was approved in October 1984: it consists of £2 million for the UNHCR, including £750,000 for allocation to income-generating projects; £300,000 for the International Committee of the Red Cross as a contribution to the costs of their three hospitals in the area; £275,000 to the League of the Red Cross for special ophthalmic work and for the establishment of a new hospital in the Punjab; and £75,000 to the Save the Children Fund's medical care programme.

Future of Hong Kong

The British-Chinese agreement on the future of Hong Kong after 1997 was signed in Peking on 19 December 1984 by Britain's Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, and by the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Mr Zhao Ziyang.

At the signing ceremony, Mrs Thatcher described the agreement (see pp 368-74, 1984) as a landmark in the life of Hong Kong, in British-Chinese relations, and in the history of international diplomacy. It established a firm basis for confidence in Hong Kong up to 1997 and beyond, and for the territory's continued stability, prosperity and growth. The agreement also fully met the political requirements of Britain and China, as well as the interests of the Hong Kong people. It had been subject to a thorough public debate among the people of Hong Kong, and, although they had expressed some reservations and had sought clarification on particular points, they had clearly judged it to be acceptable to them as a whole (see pp 439-41, 1984).

Paying tribute to the Chinese leaders for the vision and farsightedness of their approach to the negotiations, Mrs Thatcher said that the preservation of two different political, social and economic systems within one country had no precedent. 'It offers an administrative and imaginative response to the special historical circumstances of Hong Kong. The concept is an example of how apparently intractable problems can and should be resolved.'

In conclusion the Prime Minister said that the negotiations over Hong Kong had brought Britain and China closer together and had increased mutual understanding, respect and trust.

Visit to Hong Kong

After the signature of the agreement, the Prime Minister visited Hong Kong. Addressing the unofficial members of the Executive and Legislative Councils on 20 December, she said that the success of any international agreement depended upon the good faith of the signatories. The British Government would do its utmost to ensure that the agreement worked. During the talks in Peking the leaders of the Chinese Government had given Britain an assurance that the agreement would be faithfully implemented and that it was the tradition of the Chinese nation to act in good faith and to live up to its international commitments.

The discussions in Peking had confirmed that the Chinese Government was fully aware of the importance of the Basic Law, into which the provisions of the agreement would be embodied, and of the concern that people in Hong Kong should be consulted. The Chinese Prime Minister had stated that during the preparation of the Law the views of the Hong Kong people would be solicited on a wide basis, and that it would be drafted and promulgated not later than 1990.

Mrs Thatcher stressed that Britain would remain fully responsible for the administration of Hong Kong until 1997. 'We feel, as we have always felt, a deep commitment to the people of the territory, and now that the agreement is signed I pledge Her Majesty's Government's earnest efforts in the years to 1997 to ensure that Hong Kong continues to have a stable and responsive government administering the territory in accordance with the interests and the wishes of its people.

During that time, you will want and need movement towards more representative government. Hong Kong people must be able to assume responsibility for running their own affairs within the framework of the agreement. At the same time, we must avoid sudden and dramatic changes which might have a disturbing effect.'

The Prime Minister also assured Hong Kong's trading partners that the free and dynamic business environment that had attracted them for so many years would continue to flourish. Hong Kong was a going concern with a future stretching into the next century and beyond.

Britain and South Africa

Britain has supported a United Nations Security Council resolution, adopted unanimously on 13 December 1984, reaffirming the Council's arms embargo against South Africa. The three anti-apartheid campaigners who had taken refuge in the British Consulate in Durban since mid-September left the Consulate on 12 December, following the cancellation on 10 December by the South African Government of detention without trial orders against them.

Arms Embargo against South Africa

Following a debate on 13 December 1984 the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution (558) unanimously reaffirming the arms embargo it first imposed against South Africa in 1977 (see pp 415-17, 1977) and stressing the continuing need for the strict application of all its provisions. It also requested all states to refrain from importing arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles produced in South Africa, and to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution, and that the Secretary-General should report on the progress made in implementing the resolution before 31 December 1985.

Explaining Britain's vote in favour of the resolution, Britain's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, Sir John Thomson, said that the recent turmoil in South Africa had claimed many lives and that the situation there continued to be tense and highly charged.[1] The continuing tragedy of South Africa remained a source of grave concern to all and it had been the constant view of successive British governments that apartheid was unacceptable morally and was bound to prove unworkable in practice. Britain accordingly believed that it was right to maintain strong pressure on the South African Government both bilaterally and through the United Nations to abandon and dismantle apartheid. The arms embargo adopted in 1977 had been an appropriate instrument of such pressure and had been implemented strictly in British legislation and by British courts.

In the light of the most recent events in South Africa, which had caused great distress to the British Government, in Parliament and among the British public, it was right that the Security Council should now consider whether there were additional ways of influencing the South African Government to turn away from apartheid and to respect the civil and political rights of all the peoples of South Africa. At the same time the Council had to consider most carefully and responsibly the consequences of its actions and not pursue measures – whatever their popular appeal – which would in practice be counter-productive. It also needed to pay scrupulous attention to the Charter and not lightly enter into areas such as Chapter VII measures.[1] Britain was in principle opposed to trade sanctions. Wide economic sanctions were difficult to enforce, led to a hardening of views and tended to harm those who were poorest and most vulnerable, while trade was a channel for widening mutual understanding and for exercising a moderating influence.

By adopting a non-mandatory resolution, directed against importers, the Security Council had pursued a realistic course. The British Government did not import arms from South Africa and trusted the same was true for other Council members. The message from the Council for other member states of the United Nations was that they should follow suit.

Concluding, Sir John said that in supporting the resolution, Britain was also reflecting both its ineradicable opposition to apartheid and its specific disapproval of the actions of the South African Government in a recent and relevant case.[2]

Incident at the Durban Consulate

The detention orders against the three men remaining in the British Consulate in Durban (see pp 406-8, 1984) were lifted in December, as were those against 11 others, including those who had left the Consulate in October. Six of the 11, including the three former protesters at the Consulate, later appeared in court on charges of treason and contravention of the Internal Security Act.

In a statement issued on 10 December 1984 the British Government, noting that the three men's reason for seeking refuge in the Consulate was that they faced detention without trial, said that in these circumstances and having regard to humanitarian considerations they had been allowed to stay. Detention without trial had also been an issue on which Britain had voiced its concern to the South African Government. The situation with regard to the three had now changed fundamentally and Britain expected them to leave the Consulate at once. On 11 December the Natal Indian Congress announced that the three men would leave the Consulate the next

[1]A reference to the disturbances around black townships in the Johannesburg area in November 1984.

[1]Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter provides for 'action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression', including measures such as complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of means of communication and the severance of diplomatic relations.

[2]A reference to the South African Government's refusal to honour its bail commitment in the case of four South African citizens charged with arms smuggling who had been due to appear in a British court in October 1984 (see pp 406-8, 1984).

day. The British Government welcomed this decision and said that Britain had always hoped that this difficult problem could be brought to an end by the three leaving voluntarily. The three men left the Consulate on 12 December. Two were arrested on the same day and on 13 December were charged with treason.

Aid to Ethiopia

The British Government, voluntary bodies and private sources are continuing their efforts to alleviate the famine in Ethiopia and neighbouring countries.

Government Action

The British Government has maintained its programme of measures of emergency assistance to Ethiopia (see p 408, 1984) at a high level and has committed some £14 million in the three months since October 1984 which will benefit directly those suffering from the drought in Ethiopia. Assistance to Ethiopia over the two years to October 1984 totalled £15·5 million.

The Minister for Overseas Development, Mr Timothy Raison, visited Ethiopia at the end of November to see famine relief operations in action and met representatives of the Ethiopian Government, the Ethiopian Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, international agencies and voluntary organisations. Following his visit, further assistance for African drought relief totalling £3·5 million was announced on 3 December, including 15,000 tonnes of grain for Ethiopia (5,000 tonnes to be supplied through Oxfam and the remaining 10,000 tonnes from Britain's contribution to the World Food Programme). Two extra grain conveyors and 20 grain mills have been dispatched to Addis Ababa and 18,000 blankets have been airlifted. Further assistance is being provided for the Sudan, where large numbers of refugees from Ethiopia are in danger of starving to death.

Aid continues to be provided through the European Community. Following the message of the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, on 25 October 1984 to the President of the Council of Ministers urging new assistance to Ethiopia (see p 408, 1984), the Community endorsed proposals to provide food and other emergency aid worth £35 million to African countries affected by the drought. Much of this is for Ethiopia, including a further 25,000 tonnes of grain announced on 13 November for delivery in December. Britain's share of this additional assistance from the Community is £8 million. On 4 December the European Council agreed that the Community and its member states should provide 1·2 million tonnes of grain to drought-stricken countries in Africa in the period to the next harvest, and a substantial part of this will be sent to Ethiopia.

Following Mrs Thatcher's appeal to the United Nations Secretary-General on 6 November for a lead agency to be nominated within the United Nations to act as a focal point to monitor and co-ordinate the international aid effort to Ethiopia, the British Government has welcomed the appointment of Mr Kurt Gunnar Jansson as Assistant Secretary-General for Emergency Operations in Ethiopia.

Public Response

Public response to the famine has continued at a substantial level. By mid-January 1985 the major British charities (Save the Children Fund, Oxfam, the British Red Cross, Christian Aid, War on Want, the Catholic Fund for Overseas Development and others) had raised over £25 million. Other private initiatives are in progress; the 'Send a Tonne for Africa' campaign, for example, organised by British farmers, raised over £1 million by the year's end and funds amounting to about £20,000 daily are still flowing in. The Government has contributed £380,000 to the campaign to meet shipping costs.

On 27 December 1984 the British Post Office issued a specially designed cover to raise funds for drought and famine victims in Africa. Total proceeds from sales, which closed on 5 January 1985, will be channelled, with no expenses deducted, through the Disasters Emergency Committee to 25 African countries in need of assistance.

A record of a specially composed song 'Do They Know It's Christmas?' made by a group of British and American pop musicians and singers, Band Aid, to raise money for Ethiopian relief has already brought in over £7 million world-wide. The recording was organised by Mr Bob Geldof, one of the song's co-authors, and the performers gave their services free. Studio facilities, design, typesetting and artwork services, together with a large quantity of vinyl for the initial pressings, were donated free of charge, as was advertising space in music industry newspapers. Of the recommended retail selling price of £1·35, almost £1 goes to the Band Aid Trust charity fund set up by Mr Geldof.

Banking Developments

Recent developments in banking have included the announcement of a review of banking supervision, the publication of a government White Paper outlining plans for the reorganisation of the Trustee Savings Banks, and a decision by Britain's major clearing banks to change the structure of the inter-bank payments system and broaden the membership of the body which oversees it.

Banking Supervision

A review of banking supervisory arrangements in Britain has been announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr Nigel Lawson, in a statement to the House of Commons on 17 December 1984 (*Hansard*, Vol 70, No 30, col 21). The rescue operation conducted by the Bank of England in connection with Johnson Matthey Bankers (in October 1984) had, he said, raised important issues about present supervisory procedures. The review will look at 'the relationship between auditors and supervisors, staff experience and training, the handling of concentration of risk and the assessment of quality of assets, notification and collection of statistics, and the adequacy and deployment of staff resources in the banking supervision department of the Bank of England'. It will also consider whether a more satisfactory legislative framework is required than that provided by the Banking Act 1979. The review will be conducted by the Treasury, the Bank of England and an independent consultant experienced in banking.

Trustee Savings Banks – Sale of Shares

The Government has introduced legislation to bring to an end the special statutory relationship which it has had with a group of savings institutions, the Trustee Savings Banks, in order to enable them to reorganise themselves within the framework of British company law. [The Trustee Savings Banks Bill was given a second reading on 14 January by 204 votes to 37, a government majority of 167. (*Hansard*, vol 71, No. 38, cols 29-72.)]

A government White Paper[1] published in December 1984 outlines radical changes that have been taking place within the Trustee Savings Bank Group[1] within the last decade. In 1982, following consultations with the Government, the Group announced that it wished to reorganise into a public limited company and to acquire additional capital and a wider pattern of ownership by issuing shares to the public. Under existing legislation the question of the ownership of the Trustee Savings Banks is not clear. The proposed legislation enabling the Group to become a public limited company will both clarify the ownership and permit the issuing of shares to take place. While losing their links with Government departments, the Trustee Savings Banks will seek authorisation from the Bank of England under the Banking Act 1979.[2] After the reorganisation a new holding company (Trustee Savings Banks Group plc) will issue shares to existing customers, staff and the public. The proceeds of the share issue will be retained.

Local savings banks have been a feature of the community in many parts of Britain since the early nineteenth century and legislation from 1817 onwards has established a statutory framework for them covering, for example, the duties of trustees and the rights of depositors. The trustees could invest depositors' funds only with central or local government, and the banks thus functioned for much of their history as an arm of national savings. By the 1960s, however, it was becoming clear that the Trustee Savings Banks could not provide the more sophisticated financial services which depositors required. In 1973 a committee set up by the Government recommended radical changes for the banks, in particular, the development of their banking services so that they could compete effectively with the major private sector clearing banks. Legislation followed in 1976 and 1978 which enabled the Trustee Savings Banks to widen the range of their services to include personal loans, mortgages and commercial lending. At the end of 1983 3·5 million people had cheque accounts with them compared with 0·75

[1] *Trustee Savings Banks*. Cmnd 9415. HMSO, £2·45. ISBN 0 10 194150 1.

[1] The Trustee Savings Banks are now known as the Trustee Savings Banks Group following greatly increased co-operation among them in the 1970s and 1980s and following, also, a period of rapid reduction in the number of separate banks through amalgamations. There are now four Trustee Savings Banks – one each for England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Channel Islands – compared with 70 in 1971 and 20 in 1976. (In 1860 there were over 600.)

[2] Except in the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man where they will seek local authorisation.

million in 1975. The Trustee Savings Bank Group now also owns specialist companies dealing with instalment credit, credit cards, insurance, unit trusts and money market operations.

Clearing Banks Reorganisation

A new structure is to be introduced for the settlement of inter-bank transactions through clearing-house systems. The greater part of such transactions in Britain have hitherto been settled (or 'cleared') through the ten-member Bankers Clearing House,[1] based in London. Following a review[2] of existing systems, and taking into account recent developments in new technology, the Bankers Clearing House has taken two major decisions: to establish an umbrella organisation, with a broad membership, to oversee the inter-bank payments industry; and to establish three individual companies, limited by shares, each of which will cover a group of clearing operations. Thus there will be a company covering general clearing and credit clearing (the 'paper bulk clearings')[3]; a company covering high-value clearing within the City of London ('town clearing') and elsewhere in Britain (through a mechanism known as the Clearing House Automated Payments System, or 'CHAPS'); and another company covering the Bankers' Automated Clearing Service (BACS) which deals with electronic bulk clearings. Membership of the separate companies will be open to all appropriately regulated institutions which meet certain objective criteria, including compliance with technical and operational requirements, maintaining settlement facilities at the Bank of England, and meeting a minimum volume requirement (set at 0·05 per cent of the total volume of clearings covered by the company in question).

The effect of the changes will be that perhaps 25 other banks – including Citibank (a subsidiary of the Citicorp bank of the United States) and the Standard Chartered Bank, which both applied for membership of the Bankers Clearing House in 1983 – will meet the minimum volume requirement in the company covering town clearing and CHAPS, but not yet in the other clearing systems. Only one new bank (Yorkshire Bank) is likely to meet the volume requirement for the company covering paper bulk clearings, but in the BACS an extension of share ownership to a wider group of banks is predicted. Membership of the umbrella body will be mandatory for the 'settlement' (full) members of individual clearing companies. It will also be open to 'associate members' – banks and other financial institutions which use one or more of the clearing systems through the agency of a settlement member. The umbrella body will have a full-time staff.

Much detailed work is expected to be necessary before the new system can be implemented.

[1]The members are the Bank of England and the following retail banks: Barclays, the Central Trustee Savings Bank, the Co-operative Bank, Coutts and Co, Lloyds, Midland, National Girobank, National Westminster, Williams and Glyn's.

[2]*Payment Clearing Systems*, a report by members of the Bankers Clearing House. Main report available free (£10 with appendices) from Banking Information Services, 10 Lombard Street, London EC3V 9AR.

[3]The review does not cover paper bulk clearings in Scotland and Northern Ireland which operate separately.

London Area Airports

The inspector who conducted a public inquiry into planning applications for the expansion of Heathrow and Stansted airports has recommended the development of a fifth terminal at Heathrow, increasing its capacity to 53 million passengers a year, and a major expansion at Stansted.

Background

In 1979 the Government decided that the growing demand for air transport facilities in south-east England should be met by the provision of additional capacity, as traffic developed, at existing airports, particularly Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted, and by encouraging the use of regional airports (see pp 24-6, 1980). It rejected the idea of building a major new international airport of the kind considered by the Roskill Commission, which reported in 1971 (see pp 39-41, 1971), and of resuscitating the Maplin project abandoned in 1974 (see pp 323-5, 1974). Additional capacity at Britain's two largest airports is being provided. At Heathrow a fourth major terminal, due for completion later in 1985, will raise the airport's capacity from 30 million to 38 million passengers a year, while at Gatwick a second passenger terminal, which should be in operation in 1987, will increase annual capacity from 16 million to 25 million passengers. The Government envisaged a substantial expansion at Stansted as being the best way of providing further capacity before the end of the 1980s, and believed that, with the addition of a new terminal, the airport could eventually handle up to 15 million passengers a year.[1] The British Airports Authority (which owns and manages seven airports, including Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) then submitted a planning application for developing Stansted Airport to a capacity of 15 million passengers a year by building a new terminal and associated facilities. As part of its case for opposing the Authority's application, Uttlesford District Council (in whose area in north-west Essex Stansted Airport lies) proposed an alternative solution (promoted also by other nearby councils and British Airways) based upon an expansion of terminal facilities at Heathrow, and submitted outline applications for planning permission for a fifth terminal at Heathrow. The inspector, Mr Graham Eyre, considered both applications at a public inquiry between September 1981 and July 1983. Information taken from the shortened version of his report, issued on 10 December 1984, is given below.[2] The report is now being considered by the Secretary of State for the Environment and the Secretary of State for Transport. Further consideration of the Civil Aviation Bill, which received its second reading in the House of Commons in

[1]In 1983–84 Stansted handled 367,600 terminal and transit passengers; Heathrow handled 27·3 million and Gatwick 12·9 million.

[2]*The Airport Inquiries 1981–1983: Extracts from the Report of the Inspector, Graham Eyre QC.* Available from the Publication Sales Unit, Departments of the Environment and Transport, Building 1, Victoria Road, South Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 0NZ, £3. The complete report, *The Airport Inquiries 1981–1983*, is also available from the Unit, £50.

November 1984 (see pp 454-5, 1984), is being deferred until a decision on the inspector's report has been reached.

Future Capacity

The inspector says that the main objectives must encompass the need to provide sufficient effective airport capacity throughout Britain and in the London airports network as a whole. The civil aviation industry is very important and the general approach of seeking to meet the demand for additional airport capacity is clearly in the national interest. Growth of passenger demand for air travel would continue into the foreseeable future, and present and planned capacity in the London airports system would be insufficient to meet demand beyond the 1980s, so that additional capacity would be required no later than 1990. Passengers wishing to fly out of the London airports system should not be forced to use other airports. Although some of the airports outside south-east England have an extremely important role to play, regional airports should not and cannot make so large a contribution to satisfying demand as to remove or substantially reduce the need for further capacity in south-east England.

Stansted

In the inspector's view 'only Stansted can provide additional capacity to meet demand in the early to mid-1990s'. He recommends that 'subject to an unequivocal declaration of intention on the part of Government to limit the future growth of Stansted and the imposition of appropriate conditions, the necessary planning permissions to enable Stansted Airport to be developed to a capacity of 15 million passengers per annum should be granted as expeditiously as possible'. The development of Stansted should be planned to be capable of providing an ultimate capacity equivalent to that which can be accommodated in the airport's single runway; this capacity is likely to be some 25 million passengers a year. There are strong reasons for not developing a second runway at Stansted and the 'Government should make an unequivocal declaration of intention that a second main runway will not be built. No planning permission should be granted in the absence of or prior to the making of such a declaration.' The inspector also notes the need to secure the essential requirements of adequate road and rail access to Stansted.

Heathrow

The inspector criticises the decision contained in the 1978 White Paper on airports policy that Heathrow's ultimate development should be limited to four terminals (see p 71, 1978). He says that 'there can be little doubt that the application site [at Heathrow] forms part of an area which is more suitable for airport development than any other location in the South East and the whole of the UK'. Although additional capacity at Heathrow cannot be available in time to meet demand in the early 1990s (and planning permission should not be granted for any airport development at this stage), a capacity capability of an extra 15 million passengers a year could be available from the mid-1990s. This 'would make a crucial contribution to total capacity in the London system as a whole and should be developed in conjunction with other vital airport facilities so as to ensure that standards at Heathrow are commensurate with its status as the most important international airport in the world'. With this in view the inspector recommends the abandonment of the 'ill-advised and misconceived proposal to impose a limit on air transport movements' (see p 455, 1984), the provision of adequate surface access facilities (including a direct rail link and the extension of the Piccadilly underground line to link a fifth terminal with the system which already operates to Heathrow) and 'a resolute aim to commission additional terminal accommodation and other airport development at Heathrow by the mid-1990s'.

Controlling Pollution

The Government has published its response to the tenth report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution.

The Government's response to the tenth report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, covering a wide range of pollution topics (see pp 94-9, 1984), was published on 13 December 1984.[1] The Government, in accepting the broad analysis and many of the detailed points in the tenth report, states that it is firmly committed to improving the quality of the environment. Although much has already been done, there is more to do. The aim has been announced of reducing national emissions of sulphur and nitrogen oxides by 30 per cent from 1980 levels by the end of the 1990s. A major scheme has been launched to clean up the Mersey, the largest British estuary still suffering from severe pollution. Britain is at the forefront of the move to take lead out of petrol throughout Europe. However, in taking actions such as these, the Government cannot ignore costs or escape the need to spend money wisely. Its approach to the improvement of environmental quality embodies the need to base decisions on the best available scientific foundation, to set realistic goals for environmental quality, to take into account technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness, to recognise interactions between different sectors of the environment and the disposal of wastes where they will do least harm, to recognise the international dimension to many environmental problems, to take international remedies accordingly, and to inform the public about the state of the environment and to take into account public feelings in developing environmental policy.

[1] *Controlling Pollution: Principles and Prospects. The Government's Response to the Tenth Report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution.* Pollution Paper No 22. HMSO, £3·80. ISBN 0 11 751758 5.

Confidentiality

As the Royal Commission recognises, there has been a trend towards greater openness in environmental matters in recent years. The reports on the contamination of beaches at Sellafield in 1983 (see pp 350-1, 1984) are a recent example of prompt publication by the Government on a matter of public concern. Government research reports are usually made available and pollution control authorities have been disclosing a steadily increasing flow of information in the interests of keeping the public informed about the state of the environment.

The Government believes that this trend should now be accelerated, although there are cogent arguments against total openness. It accepts the thrust of the Royal Commission's overriding recommendation that there should be 'a presumption in favour of unrestricted access for the public to information which the pollution control authorities obtain or receive by virtue of their statutory powers'. Regulations are to be made to allow public access to information on discharges to water and the consent conditions attached to them, and on measures taken by water authorities (in Scotland, river purification boards) to monitor and ensure satisfactory compliance with those conditions. The recommendation is also accepted that the law should be changed to facilitate the disclosure of information obtained by the Industrial Air Pollution Inspectorate about emissions into the atmosphere. The Health and Safety Commission hopes to publish a consultative document early in 1985 about the possibilities for more extensive disclosure of information about other aspects of health and safety matters of interest to the public, having due regard to the considerations of commercial confidentiality.

The Government is establishing a working party, consisting of representatives of pollution control authorities and relevant government departments, to report within 12 months on the measures necessary to implement a uniform regime on confidentiality, consistent with the presumption in favour of unrestricted access. The objective is to satisfy as fully as possible the public's legitimate demand for information without imposing a regime which could undermine the proper relationship between the pollution control authorities and industry.

Water Quality around the Coast

Although there has been a substantial reduction in estuarine pollution in Britain in the last decade and the general quality of waters around the coastline is encouraging, the Royal Commission is right, in the Government's view, to conclude that water quality in some estuaries is not yet satisfactory and that many bathing waters and beaches still suffer from an undesirable degree of sewage contamination. The Government accepts most of the Royal Commission's recommendations, which will help to ensure that current progress is sustained and where possible extended. In particular, the Government has told water authorities that in the public expenditure plans for 1985-86 it intends that there should be a significant increase in their investment, reversing the previous trend.

In line with the Government's earlier commitments, about half of the provisions of Part II of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 have now been brought into force, covering in particular the extension of the control system and the introduction of public involvement. Early in 1985 wider enforcement powers will be made available to water authorities, and regulations will be laid to provide for the establishment of public registers of consents which have been given to make discharges. Implementation of the few remaining provisions will then be subject to public consultation.

Improving the quality of waters in estuaries and on the coast is expensive and the principal concern must be to get priorities right in the short term and to ensure that they are consistent with coherent longer-term objectives. The Government believes that a continuation of current investment levels over the next 15 to 20 years should allow improvement of all estuaries (other than the Mersey, for which separate plans exist) to fair quality (class B) and most to good quality (class A), and the elimination of those unsatisfactory sewage discharges to coastal waters which affect areas of environmental or amenity significance.

The Government expects to comply with the European Community directive on the quality of identified bathing waters, but it recognises the criticism that many bathing waters were not identified and accepts that in many cases there is no satisfactory information available on their quality. It will soon open discussions with the local authorities concerned about monitoring these waters and publishing the results. This should enable authorities to identify areas where remedial action is required, although it is expected that in many cases water quality will already meet the standards of the directive.

Colliery Spoil on Beaches

The Government recognises the strength of local feeling about the tipping of colliery waste off the coast of Durham and the need to end it as soon as practicable. The cost of doing so in the immediate future would be prohibitive, but the search will continue for a cost-effective and environmentally acceptable solution within a realistic period.

Straw-Burning

Recognising the problems which can arise as a result of careless burning of straw and stubble, the Government has strengthened the model on which local authority by-laws about this are based in England and Wales. Although more stringent controls may be needed in future, prohibition of straw- and stubble-burning would not be practicable so long as there remain some 5 to 6 million tonnes annually of straw for which no alternative outlets are available. Some £2 million a year is currently being spent on research and development of alternative uses of straw.

Long-Term Air Monitoring

The importance of long-term air monitoring in providing a basis for the development of air pollution control policies is accepted. Steps have

already been taken to increase from six to nine the number of primary sites on which the most important pollutants are measured nationally; there are plans for these sites to begin baseline monitoring of nitrogen oxides and ozone.

Acid Deposition Research

The Government wholly accepts the Royal Commission's view that acid deposition is one of the most important pollution issues of the present time, and that high priority should be given to research in this field. Recognising the urgent need for improved scientific understanding in these areas to provide the basis for policy decision-making, the Government has already substantially increased support for research. Total expenditure in Britain on relevant research is currently running at some £5 million a year.

The Government's views on sulphur dioxide emissions have been made clear in its response to the House of Commons Select Committee on the Environment's report on acid rain (see p 25).

Gases Affecting Stratospheric Ozone

Although the Government does not consider that a basis as yet exists for the initiatives on chlorofluorocarbons recommended by the Royal Commission, it has accepted that restriction of the use of these is a wise precaution. In practice, a reduction of 35 per cent has been achieved, which the Government regards as an appropriate response to the problem in the light of current knowledge. Britain was instrumental in establishing a Co-ordinating Committee on the Ozone Layer under the United Nations Environment Programme and is participating fully in negotiations to prepare a Convention on Protection of the Ozone Layer.

Research is being carried out by a number of government-backed bodies into the implications for the climate of the slow build-up of carbon dioxide.

Shorter Notes

LOAN GUARANTEE SCHEME

The Loan Guarantee Scheme under which the Government backs loans by banks and other financial institutions to new or existing small firms (see p 232 and pp 381-2, 1984) has been extended until 31 December 1985, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Industry, Mr David Trippier, announced in the House of Commons on 17 December 1984. The main terms of the scheme would remain unchanged, with the Government guaranteeing 70 per cent of loans made by participating lenders and charging a 5 per cent premium on the amount guaranteed. As now, no personal security would be taken on scheme loans, but in future where an applicant had such security which he was unwilling to pledge against a commercial loan he would not be eligible for a scheme loan. In order to contain costs, a ceiling on lending of £50 million would be imposed in 1985. Lenders would be asked to insist on minimum standards of appraisal and financial reporting from all applicants to increase the survival rate among borrowers. From 1 June to 30 November 1984, 703 guarantees were issued in respect of almost £23 million of bank lending.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 70, No 30, written answers, col 25; Department of Trade and Industry press notice, 17.12.84.

EXCHANGE RISK GUARANTEE SCHEME

Changes to the Exchange Risk Guarantee Scheme (see p 381, 1984) were made known to the House of Commons by the Minister of State for Industry, Mr Norman Lamont, on 18 December 1984. Under the scheme, exchange risk cover was provided for loans advanced by the European Investment Bank (EIB – see p 155, 1983) and the European Coal and Steel Community (a European Community institution) mainly to companies in the assisted areas (see pp 449-53, 1984); the Government had decided to extend this part of the scheme until 31 March 1985 so that the scheme's future could be reviewed in the light of recent changes in government regional industrial policy. The scheme also provided exchange risk cover for loans to small firms under the New Community Instrument (which operates through the EIB on behalf of the European Community and supplies loan finance on similar terms to that offered by the EIB); the Government had concluded that, taking account of rising costs and the availability of alternative sources of funding, this cover should be discontinued after 1984 outside the assisted areas.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 70, No 31, written answers, cols 127-8; Department of Trade and Industry press notice, 18.12.84.

AID FOR SHIPBUILDING, STEEL AND TEXTILE AREAS

A special programme of support worth £101 million from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)[1] and the British Government to help shipbuilding and steel- and textile-producing areas in Britain to cope with job losses was launched on 26 November 1984 by the European Community commissioner for regional policy, Signor Antonio Giolitti, and the Minister of State for Industry, Mr Norman Lamont. The programme is designed to promote the growth of employment in small firms (employing up to 200 people) engaged in activities other than shipbuilding and steel and textile production, both directly through the provision of

[1]Set up by the European Community to correct major regional imbalances in the Community, particularly those resulting from over-dependence on agriculture, industrial change and structural underemployment.

assistance to special measures of support and indirectly through improvements to infrastructural services and the environment in the areas concerned. The aid can be spent at any time until 31 March 1989. The European Community element of the programme (£89 million) is a second round of 'non-quota' aid from the ERDF; the first round in 1980 provided £29 million for British steel and shipbuilding areas (see p 315, 1980).

Of the total programme, £38 million is to be devoted to supporting projects (carried out with public funds) for the conversion of disused buildings into suitable premises for small firms and environmental improvements. The remaining £63 million will be offered in the form of grants – most of which will represent 55 or 70 per cent of costs – to small firms and providers of services to small firms for the following purposes: professional consultancy advice; provision of common services; market analyses; help with technical innovation and information; additional investment; and help to obtain access to risk capital. Grants will also be available for the establishment and extension of counselling services and economic promotion agencies. In England, the support schemes for which grants will be available are to be known as Business Improvement Services and will have £40 million (from the total of £63 million for Britain as a whole) in funding.

Sources: Department of Trade and Industry press notices, 26.11.84.

MULTI-FIBRE ARRANGEMENT

A gradual relaxation of restrictions (perhaps over a period of five or six years) on British imports of textiles and clothing from low-cost countries is recommended by an independent, government-commissioned, report published on 13 December 1984 (see p 275, 1983). (At present international trade in textiles and clothing is regulated within the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT – see p 218, 1984) by the Multi-Fibre Arrangement (MFA – see p 299, 1983) which allows a measure of restraint on imports from low-cost countries into industrialised countries. Britain participates in the MFA not unilaterally but as a member of the European Community.)

Abolition of the MFA might, the report states, reduce prices of textiles and clothing imported into Britain by 5 to 10 per cent, while wholesale prices of British products could fall by 5 per cent; if import prices were to drop by 10 per cent, retail prices of clothing might fall by 5 per cent. Liberalisation would also lead to a lower sterling exchange rate, making exports of other British industries more competitive; the resulting loss of employment in textiles and clothing would probably be more than offset by an increase in employment elsewhere in the economy. Thus, while protection (by encouraging investment) may have yielded gains in the form of economies of scale and innovation and higher employment in the textile and clothing industries, the benefits of liberalisation to the economy as a whole would appear to outweigh the costs.

The report concludes that there are formidable barriers to British textile and clothing exports in most parts of the world. It suggests that it would be helpful if a general lowering of import barriers (not only those affecting textiles and clothing) could be secured from those developing countries which are highly protective towards their own industries.

The Government would welcome the views of interested parties on the report before adopting a position on the future trade regime for textiles and clothing prior to negotiations in the European Community and the GATT.

Sources: *The Multi-Fibre Arrangement and the UK Economy*, by Professor Z. A. Silberston. HMSO, £4·80. ISBN 0 11 513815 3; *Hansard*, Vol 69, No 28, written answers, col 556.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL AT SEA

A review by a panel of independent scientists[1] of radioactive waste disposal at sea, commissioned by the Government and the Trades Union Congress, has found no evidence of harm to man or the natural environment. Announcing the publication of the panel's report on 13 December 1984, the Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Patrick Jenkin, said that it was 'an extensive and searching review of the scientific evidence and of all the issues'. The report recognised that the scientific work undertaken in Britain on radioactive waste disposal at sea had been 'of the highest quality'. No evidence of harm to man or the environment had been revealed by the review, but in the panel's opinion there remained some uncertainties about the long-term natural processes involved. It recommended that the use of sea disposal for low-level and intermediate-level radioactive wastes, which had been suspended in 1983 (see p 350, 1984), should not be resumed until completion of the international reviews in progress. The Government accepted that recommendation – the London Dumping Convention review and the review of the disposal site by the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development were both due for completion later in 1985. In addition, future dumping would also be subject to any changes that might be made to the definition of prohibited wastes currently being considered by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The report also recommended that a comparative assessment should be made and published of all disposal and storage options, at sea and on land, in order to establish the best practicable environmental options for the various types of low-level and intermediate-level radioactive waste.

[1] *Report of the Independent Review of Disposal of Radioactive Waste in the North-East Atlantic.* HMSO, £4·90. ISBN 0 11 751772 0.

The Department of the Environment would carry out such an assessment, in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and with the Radioactive Waste Management Advisory Committee, with the aim of issuing a report by summer 1985.

Source: *Hansard*, Vol 69, No 28, written answers, cols 579-80.

ACID RAIN

The Government has published its response to the report of the House of Commons Environment Committee on acid rain.[1] The report is welcomed as timely, but it is noted that the widening of the term 'acid rain' to cover a variety of forms of air pollution arising from a number of emissions and from chemical interactions of those emissions in the atmosphere has blurred important issues which need to be disentangled if effective solutions are to be found.

Building on the reduction by nearly 40 per cent of sulphur dioxide emissions which has been achieved since 1970, the Government aims to achieve a further reduction of 30 per cent from the 1980 levels by the end of the 1990s, and a similar reduction in levels of nitrogen oxide emissions. It also intends to support stricter emission standards for petrol-engined cars, achievable by the development of 'lean burn' engines. It does not believe that the very substantial expenditure (some £1,500 million) which would be required to install flue-gas desulphurisation plant at existing power stations can be justified while scientific knowledge is developing and the environmental benefit remains uncertain, but it will continue to encourage the development of new technologies which can provide more cost-effective solutions.

The Government agrees with the Committee on the need to continue to reduce emissions contributing to acid deposition. However, it is clear that the problems are much more complex than was earlier envisaged. While air pollutants emitted in Britain may be involved in damaging processes found in this and other countries, the precise role of primary and secondary pollutants varies with the circumstances. It seems unlikely, for example, that pollution crossing international boundaries is the dominant element in ozone concentrations, identified as a possible contributory factor to forest damage, or that vehicle emissions in Britain form anything more than a very small proportion of pollution in other countries. The contribution to environmental damage of distant and local sources also varies; for example, damage to stonework seems due principally to very local sources.

To help resolve present uncertainties Britain is continuing to support a balanced programme of research on air pollutants, their effects and the technology for their control, participating fully in international research efforts already deployed in those fields.[1]

Source: *Acid Rain: The Government's Reply to the Fourth Report from the Environment Committee.* Cmnd 9397. HMSO, £3·15. ISBN 0 10 193970 1.

[1]*Fourth Report from the Environment Committee: Acid Rain.* 2 vols. HMSO, £5·55 and £12·25. ISBN 0 10 008664 0 and 0 10 008764 7.

[1]For a full statement on Britain's approach to acid rain see pp 266-7, 1984 and COI reference paper *Acid Rain: the British Approach*, No 244/84.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Shorter Notes

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR

The United Nations has designated 1985 as International Youth Year to highlight the needs and aspirations of young people. The themes of the Year are participation, development and peace. According to UN guidelines on the interpretation of these themes, participation implies that young people are capable of deciding on matters concerning their own lives, should have the opportunity to make decisions and should feel that their contribution is valued. Development applies not only to the development of the personality of individual young people but also to the process of social, economic and political change which will help young people realise their full potential. Peace is seen as essential for the future of young people. It is necessary to educate young people for peace and to recognise their potential for securing peace.

In Britain the Government has asked youth service organisations to establish co-ordinating committees in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The English committee, for example, comprises ten young people under the age of 25 and ten members representing bodies concerned with voluntary youth work, education, industry, trade unions and the churches. It is intended that the activities of the year will be mainly sponsored at local level by the wide variety of organisations concerned with young people. Among the events so far announced are a festival of music, theatre and dance, a street arts festival, an Oxfam fête, seminars on issues affecting young people and a lobby of Parliament on youth affairs. It is also hoped that the Year will see the start of projects and schemes that will be of long-term benefit to young people.

As part of its contribution to the Year the Government is inviting 250 young people from 22 European countries to visit Britain in the summer with the aim of increasing mutual understanding among the youth of Europe.

Sources: Literature from English IYY Committee, 57 Chalton Street, London NW1 1HU and Department of Education and Science press notice, 24.10.84.

EUROPEAN MUSIC YEAR

The creation of a permanent European Baroque Orchestra and the staging of a festival of the music of Handel will be among Britain's most important contributions to European Music Year in 1985. The Year, which has been designated by the European Parliament and the Council of Europe to coincide with the 300th anniversary of the births of Bach, Handel and Domenico Scarlatti, will be a celebration of every branch of musical activity involving over 20 European countries and is expected to be the largest international music festival ever held. Its main objectives are to promote music of all kinds and periods; to broaden public access to music and encourage active participation in musical life, in particular by young people and minorities; to offer better opportunities and social conditions for young composers and performers; to reinforce music education and training; and to safeguard, enhance and enrich Europe's musical heritage. Britain's contribution to the Year is being organised by a national committee chaired by the Duke of Kent, which reports to the European Organising Committee in Strasbourg.

Six British projects are included in the 31 interstate events (that is, events involving participation by three or more countries) to be held during the Year. The most important of these projects will be the founding of a European Baroque Orchestra based in Oxford, whose aim will be to increase the number of European musicians familiar and proficient in Baroque performing techniques. Other contributions include a composers' competition organised by the Hallé Orchestra in Manchester, an international summer school for music and dance in West Yorkshire and a conductors' course for 23 postgraduate students from participating countries organised by the British Broadcasting Corporation in association with the Royal Northern College of Music in Manchester.

In common with all the other participating countries, Britain has designated one day as European Music Day, to act as a focal point for the Year's celebrations. On this day (in Britain it will be 22 June) performers throughout Britain, including amateur musicians, will take part in musical events of many kinds.

The main national event of the Year within Britain will be the Handel Tercentenary Festival from 12 to 22 July. The Festival will open with a Handel concert in Westminster Abbey on 12 July followed by performances of his music in other famous churches and concert halls in London. At the same time a Handel Research Conference will be held from 15 to 19 July at the Royal Society of Arts in London.

Twelve new orchestral works have been specially commissioned for the Year by the British Broadcasting Corporation; eight of the works are by British composers and four by composers from other European countries. During 1985 BBC Television will screen documentaries on the lives of Bach, Handel, and Scarlatti, and performances of their works.

Source: European Music Year press kit, available from European Music Year, 1 Surrey Street, London WC2R 2PS.

POET LAUREATE

A new Poet Laureate, Mr Ted Hughes, OBE, was appointed on 19 December in succession to Sir John Betjeman, CBE, C.Lit, who died in May 1984. The Poet Laureate is a member of the Royal Household whose duty is to compose verse to mark Royal occasions such as births, deaths and marriages. The holder of the office, which dates from 1670, receives an annual remuneration of £70 plus a case of wine.

Mr Hughes, one of Britain's most distinguished poets, was born in 1930 and educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge. His awards include the Guinness Poetry Award 1958; the Somerset Maugham Award 1960; the City of Florence Poetry Prize 1967; and the Queen's Medal for Poetry 1974.

His collections of verse include *The Hawk in the Rain* (1957), *Lupercal* (1960), *Crow* (1970), *Gaudete* (1977), *Moortown* (1979), and *River* (1983).

DOCUMENTATION

General

British Winners of Nobel Prizes. COI, No 99/84.

Government and Administration

The Royal Yacht and the Queen's Flight The Monarchy. COI, No 68/84. COI, No 112/84.

Government Purchasing: Report to the Prime Minister on the Review of Government Contract and Procurement Procedures. This Cabinet Office report of the multi-department review of contract and procurement procedures, which formed part of the efficiency programme announced by the Prime Minister in December 1982, identifies four main areas in which improvements need to be made in government purchasing. The Prime Minister has agreed to set up a small, expert central unit to help departments make the necessary improvements. HMSO, £5·40. ISBN 0 11 430002 X.

Public Bodies 1984. Lists and provides factual information about non-departmental public bodies and National Health Service authorities, nationalised industries and public corporations. HMSO, £10·50. ISBN 0 11 630714 5.

Local Government in Britain. COI, No 12/RP/84.

After the GLC. Local Government Reorganisation: Government Policy Explained and *After the Metropolitan County Councils. Local Government Reorganisation: Government Policy Explained*. These leaflets, prepared by the Department of the Environment, answer some of the questions being asked about the proposed arrangements in London and the metropolitan counties. Available free from Room P1/118, Department of the Environment, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3EB.

Fire Statistics United Kingdom 1983. Home Office, £3·50. ISBN 0 86252 171 8. Available from S3 Division, Home Office, 50 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT.

The Distribution of Functions between the Headquarters and Local Offices of the Proposed Crown Prosecution Service (see pp 356–7, 1983). The main proposal in this White Paper is that in the great majority of cases decisions on prosecutions should be taken locally, while the Director of Public Prosecutions and his headquarters staff will remain responsible for decisions on prosecutions in particular cases of importance or difficulty. Cmnd 9411. HMSO, £1·30. ISBN 0 10 194110 2.

Magistrates' Domestic Courts: New Perspectives, edited by T. F. Marshall (Home Office Research and Planning Unit Paper No 28). The report of a one-day conference in London in May 1984 at which new statistical and research information was presented and the future of the magistrates' domestic jurisdiction was discussed. Topics covered include the new system of domestic court statistics; variations between courts in their organisation and procedure; the role of welfare in a justice system; conciliation; potential for reconciliation and counselling; and the roles of the magistracy, court officers and solicitors. Available free from the Home Office, Room 278, Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT.

External Affairs and Defence

Falkland Islands. Fifth Report from the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, Session 1983–84.

Vol 1. Report and Minutes of Proceedings. HMSO, £5·55. ISBN 0 10 009004 4.

Vol 2. Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. HMSO, £8·40. ISBN 0 10 009014 1.

Gibraltar. COI, No 176/84.

The British Council, The First Fifty Years, by Frances Donaldson. Jonathan Cape, £16. ISBN 0 224 02041 2.

The Commonwealth Development Corporation. COI, No 249/84.

Economic and Scientific Affairs

The Government's Economic Policy: Autumn Statement. First Report from the Treasury and Civil Service Committee, Session 1984–85. Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. Comments

on the mechanism by which the Cabinet fixes priorities in public expenditure, as reflected in the Autumn Statement (see pp 446-9, 1984), on the presentation of planning totals, and on government predictions of tax adjustments for 1985-86. HMSO, £7·45. ISBN 0 10 204485 6.

Britain's Economy: Government Expenditure Plans and Economic Forecast. (Reproduced from *Survey of Current Affairs*.) COI, No 253/84.

The Collection of Value Added Tax: Proposals for implementing the Customs and Excise Recommendations in Volumes 1 and 2 of the Keith Committee's Report (see p 145, 1983). Sets out draft clauses, to be included in the 1985 Finance Bill, dealing with traders who fail to comply with VAT law. HMSO, £3·95. ISBN 0 11 260501 X.

Audit Commission for Local Authorities in England and Wales: Report and Accounts, year ended 31 March 1984. The first annual report from the Commission, which was established under the Local Government Finance Act 1982 (see pp 50-1, 1982). HMSO, £2·20. ISBN 0 11 701091 X.

Payment Clearing Systems (see p 20). A report by members of the Bankers Clearing House. Main report available free (£10 with appendices) from Banking Information Services, 10 Lombard Street, London EC3V 9AR.

Trustee Savings Banks (see p 19). Cmnd 9415. HMSO, £2·45. ISBN 0 10 194150 1.

Trade and Industry Committee, Session 1983-84: The Growth in the Imbalance of Trade in Manufactured Goods between the UK and existing and prospective members of the EEC; Observations by the Government on the Second Report of the Trade and Industry Committee in Session 1983-84. HMSO, £1·30. ISBN 0 10 263384 3.

Proposed Changes to British Overseas Trade Board Services. Consultation document outlining the Government's general approach towards providing help to exporters: government resources are to be concentrated on assisting smaller and medium-sized firms. Available free from British Overseas Trade Board, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET.

Britain's Regional Industrial Policy: A Review. (Reproduced from *Survey of Current Affairs*.) COI, No 254/84.

The Multi-Fibre Arrangement and the UK Economy, by Professor Z. A. Silberston (see p 24). HMSO, £4·80. ISBN 0 11 513815 3.

Policies and Priorities for Design. A report by a strategy group based in the Design Council (see pp 234-5, 1984) which recommends that top priority should be given to convincing higher management that design and designers can make a powerful contribution towards profitability. Available free from the Design Council, 28 Haymarket, London SW1Y 4SU.

The Government's Response to the Committee's Ninth Report (Session 1983-84) on Energy Research, Development and Demonstration in the United Kingdom. Second Report from the House of Commons Energy Committee, Session 1984-85. HMSO, £2·85. ISBN 0 10 207585 9.

Transport Statistics Great Britain 1973-1983. HMSO, £19·50. ISBN 0 11 550665 9.

The Airport Inquiries 1981-1983: Extracts from the Report of the Inspector, Graham Eyre QC (see p 20). Available from the Publication Sales Unit, Departments of the Environment and Transport, Building 1, Victoria Road, South Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 0NZ, £3. The complete report, *The Airport Inquiries 1981-1983*, is also available from the Unit, £50.

Marine Pilotage: A Consultative Document. Contains proposals for simplifying the arrangement of marine pilotage in Britain, with responsibility being placed on local harbour authorities for determining their own pilotage requirements. Available from the Department of Transport, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3EB.

Annual Review of Government Funded R and D [Research and Development] *1984*. Cabinet Office. HMSO, £7·50. ISBN 0 11 630826 5.

The Natural Environment Research Council Report for 1983-84. NERC. Available from HMSO, £5. ISBN 0 11 983714 5.

Controlling Pollution: Principles and Prospects. The Government's Response to the Tenth Report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (see p 21). Pollution Paper No 22. HMSO, £3·80. ISBN 0 11 751758 5.

Acid Rain: The Government's Reply to the Fourth Report from the Environment Committee (see p 25). Cmnd 9397. HMSO, £3·15. ISBN 0 10 193970 1.

Report of the Independent Review of Disposal of Radioactive Waste in the North-East Atlantic (see p 24). HMSO, £4·90. ISBN 0 11 751772 0.

Social and Cultural Affairs

Social Trends No 15, 1985. A Central Statistical Office annual publication which brings together statistics relating to social policies and conditions. It contains demographic data and statistics on living standards, housing, income, employment, leisure, health, education and law enforcement. There is a special article on social attitudes. HMSO, £19·95. ISBN 0 11 620102 9*.

The Tape-Recording of Police Interviews with Suspects: An Interim Report, by C F Willis (Home Office Research Study No 82). Describes the background to the setting-up of field trials which began in early 1984 in six police areas, the basis

on which the police areas were chosen and the methodology and programme of research to be carried out. HMSO, £4·20. ISBN 0 11 340776 9.

Victims of Crime: The Dimensions of Risk, by M. R. Gottfredson (Home Office Research Study No 81). A report which looks at information on crime collected in *The British Crime Survey* (see pp 143-4, 1983). It concludes, among other findings, that the risks of serious crime for most people in England and Wales are very small, although a high-risk minority fare less well: that living in inner cities increases risks, while being elderly does not. HMSO, £4·20. ISBN 0 11 340775 0.

Reparation, Conciliation and Mediation: A Survey of Current Projects and Plans in England and Wales, by T F Marshall (Home Office Research and Planning Unit Paper No 27). In response to a growth in interest in recent years in victim-offender conciliation, this survey outlines the origins of the movement towards mediation, describes the types of project involved, and gives details of all the existing schemes and some of those that are planned. It finds that 25 mediation or reparation schemes are in existence; and an additional 42 family conciliation schemes catering for divorcing couples in dispute over arrangements for the custody of and access to their children. The survey also identifies plans for 79 other schemes. Available free from the Home Office, Room 278, Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT.

On the State of the Public Health for the Year 1983. Annual report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Health and Social Security. HMSO, £7·75. ISBN 0 11 321012 4.

Statistical Bulletin No 2/84. Department of Health and Social Security. Gives detailed information about trends in activity in National Health Service hospitals in England in the period 1973 to 1983. £1. ISBN 0 946539 53 7. Available from Department of Health and Social Security, Information Division, Government Buildings, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 1AY.

Education Observed 2. A review of published reports by Her Majesty's Inspectors on primary schools and 11-16 and 12-16 comprehensive schools. Department of Education and Science. ISBN 0 85522 156 9. Available free from the Department of Education and Science, Publications Despatch Centre, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 1AZ.

Education in Northern Ireland in 1983. HMSO Belfast, £3·60. ISBN 0 337 04147 4.

BBC Annual Report and Handbook 1985: Incorporating the Annual Report and Accounts 1983-84. BBC, £6·50. ISBN 0 563 20371 4.

Television and Radio 1985: Guide to Independent Broadcasting. The annual Handbook of the Independent Broadcasting Authority. Published by the IBA, £3·90. ISBN 0 900485 48 5.

Taking the Initiative: A Survey of Low-Cost Home Owners, by Judith Littlewood and Serena Mason. HMSO, £4·95. ISBN 0 11 751768 2.

Historic Buildings Council for England: Annual Report 1983-84. HMSO, £6·60. ISBN 0 10 206985 9. On 1 April 1984 the responsibilities of the Council were transferred to the new Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission.

SURVEY
of Current Affairs

© *Crown copyright 1985*

Printed in the UK and Published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
£1.75 net

Annual subscription including indices and postage £22

Dd. 8334291 C10 JANUARY/1985
ISBN 0 11 727635 9 Vol. 15 No. 1
ISSN 0039—6214